37-5
403

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.
Case, Division
Shelf, 210 Section
Book, No

Presented to the Library of the Theol. Seminary at Princeton, N. J. by Azariah G. Orton

A

# THEORETIC EXPLANATION

OF THE

# SCIENCE OF SANCTITY.

ACCORDING TO

REASON, SCRIPTURE, COMMON SENSE, AND THE ANALOGY OF THINGS:

CONTAINING

AN IDEA OF GOD: OF HIS CREATIONS, AND KINGDOMS: OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES: OF THE CHRISTIAN TRINITY, AND OF THE GOSPEL SYSTEM.

BY THOMAS FESSENDEN, A. M.
PASTOR OF THE CHURCH IN WALPOLE, (*New-Hampshire.*)

*Beware lest any man spoil you through Philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.*
PAUL.

*I have raised up thy Sons O Zion, against thy Sons O Greece.*
ZECHARIAH.

*They received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so: Therefor many of them believed.*
ACTS.

PRINTED
BY WILLIAM FESSENDEN.
FOR THE AUTHOR.
*Brattleboro'.*
1804.

# PREFACE.

RELIGION is the chief concern of man, and the knowledge and practice of it, are every individuals proper buſineſs. The theoretic is the foundation of the practic part of it, as without knowledge neither the heart, nor life can be good. Every perſon therefore ſhould engage in the ſtudy of it, and not leave it entirely to that order of men which is ſet a part to teach, and recommend it to others. That *knowledge of the holy which is underſtanding*, can no more come by chance, be expected by immediate infuſion, or be transferred by imputation, than any other ſcience can be acquired by theſe means. Men may *live* without an acquaintance with other ſciences, but this knowledge is neceſſary to the *life* of every moral being. The deſign of the author, in the following pages, is to give a conſiſtent account of God, and of his true religion; of the original, the preſent, and of the future ſtate of the rational univerſe, and particularly of the human ſpecies. It is an event much to be deſired that the credit of this firſt of ſciences for importance, and utility, might be revived; and that in this age of free enquiry, and great improvement in other ſciences, this may not lacquey after them in its advances towards perfection. The writer is far from ſuppoſing with a late eminent divine in an election ſermon, that no real uſeful improvement can be made in the ſcience of theology.* An indolent acquieſcence in ſo ignoble, and unfounded a ſentiment, or ſome other faulty reaſon, is the cauſe that ſo many profeſſional teachers of religion, men of the greateſt ability, and ampleſt means of making proficiency in divinity, turn their attention to other ſtudies, and ſeek celebrity, to the neglect of this divine ſtudy, which is their life in more ſenſes than one. It is confeſſed that peculiar difficulties have attended the ſtudy of the ſcriptures where a man was diſpoſed to think and judge for himſelf. See Biſhop Hare's letter to a young clergyman upon this ſubject, who ſcruples not to affirm that the orthodox faith, ſo called, never was the reſult of an impartial ſtudy of the holy ſcriptures. Dr. Watts in his miſcellanies under "ſouls in fetters," Chap. lvii hath ſomething to this purpoſe, worth tranſcribing.

*Dr. Stiles.

"There are ſome noble ſouls impriſoned from their infancy, within the pale of a particular clan, or narrow tribe, and they muſt never dare to think beyond thoſe limits. What ſhameful bars are laid in the way, to obſtruct the progreſs of knowledge, and the growth of the intellectual world! Generous ſentiments are ſtifled, and forbid to be born, leſt the parent of them, who perhaps belongs to one *ſect*, ſhould be ſuſpected of too much intimacy with another; and a thouſand brave, and free thoughts, are cruſhed to death in the very bud, leſt they ſhould look like the offſpring of *a foreign tribe*, when they appear in open light.

"What a wretched influence names, and ſects, and parties have upon the commonwealth of chriſtianity! we hardly dare believe ourſelves, when we have found out a truth if our anceſtors did not believe it too: O where ſhall that city ſtand whoſe inhabitants ſhall traffic in intellectual treaſures, and ſet forth all their new improvements, and acquiſitions in open day light, without the danger of public penalties or reproach? Where ſhall that happy race be born, who ſhall ſee truth with an unbiaſſed ſoul, and ſhall ſpeak it freely to mankind, without the fear of parties, or the odium of ſingularity? When ſhall that golden age ariſe, in which every rich genius ſhall produce his brighteſt ſentiments to the honor of God, and to the general profit of men, and yet ſtand exempted from common ſlander? When ſhall the ſacred mines of ſcripture be digged yet deeper than ever, and the hidden riches thereof be brought out of their long obſcurity, to adorn the doctrine of God our Savior? O that theſe dark and ſtormy days of party, and prejudice were rolled away; that men would once give leave to their fellow chriſtians to ſpell out *ſome* ancient and unknown glories of the perſon of Chriſt which are contained in ſcripture, and to unfold ſome hidden wonders of his goſpel! The wiſeſt of men know yet but in part: and it is always poſſible to grow wiſer, at leaſt on this ſide heaven; but public prejudice is a friend to darkneſs: nor could ignorance, and error, without this ſhield have defended their thrones ſo long, among creatures of reaſon, under the light of divine ſun beams." Since the Dr's day a few unfettered ſouls in Europe, and America, have queſtioned and expoſed ſome points of reputed orthodoxy, venerable for their antiquity, and ſtrong by the au-

thority of creeds, fathers, councils, catechifms and national eſtabliſhments; but much remains to be done to ſet bible truth in a clear point of light. The ſpeculations of Plato, and the ſcholaſticiſm of the ſtagirite are ſtill blended with the ſcience of ſanctity; tradition and metephyſics are not yet diſcarded from divinity. Dr. Watts in his improvement of the mind gives ſome very good directions as to ſtudy which have not been followed either by himſelf, or others in theological reſearches. "The firſt direction is to diſtinguiſh between words and things. The greateſt danger is in the ſacred ſcience of theology, where ſettled terms and phraſes have been pronounced divine, and orthodox, which yet have had no meaning in them. The ſcholaſtic divinity furniſheth with numerous inſtances of this folly. For many ages all truth, and all hereſy have been determined by ſuch ſenſeleſs teſts, and by words without ideas; ſuch ſhibboleths as theſe have decided the ſecular fates of men; and biſhopricks or burnings, mitres or faggots, have been the rewards of different perſons, according as they pronounced theſe conſecrated ſyllables, or not pronounced them. To deſpiſe them, to doubt or deny them was torture and death."

"Another direction is to be very curious in examining all propoſitions that pretend to the honor of being general principles, and not without evidence to admit into this rank mere matters of common fame, or commonly received opinions; no nor the general determinations of the learned; or the eſtabliſhed articles of any church or nation, &c. for there are many learned preſumptions, many ſyndical and national miſtakes, many eſtabliſhed falſehoods, as well as many vulgar errors wherein multitudes of men have followed one another for whole ages, almoſt blindfold. It is of great importance for every man to be careful that theſe general principles are juſt and true; for one error may lead us into thouſands, which will naturally follow, if once a leading falſehood be admitted." The uſe that hath been made in divinity of the words *eſſence*, *hypoſtatical*, *nature*, conſidered as an agent of the word *man* itſelf, and of *flesh*, and *ſpirit*, and many others; and the reception of ſome doctrines without the exercise of reaſon, and common ſenſe, are juſtly owing to the not adhering to the above rules. Hence originates the doctrines of a triune Deity, an eternal Son,

of a Chriſt preexiſtent to Jeſus who was made Chriſt, placing the officer before the perſon, of one nature's being in one place, and the perſon whoſe nature it is being in another, and one nature's acting, and the other nature of the ſame perſon being quieſcent, of the humiliation, and exaltation of a nature, of a ſon's being ſelf exiſtent yet derived, of an incarnation by the aſſumption of a reaſonable ſoul, as well as true body, of a perſons being born man and a Son of man, who had only a divine Father, born of a woman who knew not a man, &c. Theſe and more abſurdities, are held to by the reputed orthodox, and all becauſe they do not diſtinguiſh between *words*, and *things*, or take for general true principles, things not true, or deſerving of this honor. To vindicate their abſurdities recourſe is had to *myſteries*, which with ſome are inexplicables and unintelligibles. This bars all enquiry into them only by themſelves, and when they have become bewildered by words of their own without knowledge, they forbid under the pains of ſuffering as hereticks, all who dare to peep through the vail, into *their* ſecrets. And when this will not do, the diſtinction of above reaſon, and againſt reaſon is preſented; and the mode of exiſtence in the divine being is ſaid to be different from that of all other beings. The diſtinction of above reaſon, and contrary to reaſon is futile, as they uſe it, and the other about the mode of the divine exiſtences is an unknowable even to them. Exiſtence, perſonality, paternity, individuality, and regality, as to *him*, mean the ſame thing, as when applied to men, with only a ſpecific difference in the ſubject, and a gradual difference alſo. Brucker in his hiſtory of Philoſophy, as tranſlated by Enfield, tells us that, "The Jews ſuppoſed the ſtream of wiſdom which they profeſſed to derive from their own ſacred fountain, had formerly flowed out of their own incloſure into neighboring countries; and that the oriental Egyptian, and Grecian ſchools had been at firſt indebted to the land of Iſrael for their knowledge. Philo and other learned Jews to flatter their own vanity, and that of their countrymen, induſtriouſly propagated this opinion: and the more learned Fathers of the chriſtian church, who thought highly of the Grecian particularly of the Platonic philoſophy, haſtily adopted it, imagining that if they could trace back the moſt valuable doctrines of paganiſm to a Hebrew origin, this could not fail to

recommend the Jewiſh and Chriſtian religion to the notice of gentile philoſophers. Many learned divines relying implicitely upon theſe authorities, have maintained the ſame unfounded opinion. The Fathers of the church ſoon departed from the ſimplicity of the apoſtolic doctrine, and corrupted the purity of the chriſtian faith with philoſophic mixtures. Firſt by allegorical interpretations. Secondly by ſubtle metaphyſical ſpeculations, which the learned converts from paganiſm, brought with them, and retained a fondneſs for, and made an unjuſtifiable uſe of to bring the philoſophers over to chriſtianity. The Fathers ſuppoſed that what was valuable in the pagan philoſophy, was the remnant of ſome former revelation from the Logos, an idea of whom they took from Plato, or had been purloined from the Hebrews or Chriſtians, and might therefore fairly be claimed by the chriſtian church. Juſtin Martyr, the firſt platonizer of St. John's Logos, ſuppoſed it to be the emanating reaſon of the divine nature: that he inſpired the prophets, and was afterwards the Chriſt who appeared in fleſh, and to have been participated by the patriarchs and the more excellent pagan philoſophers: and that every tenet in their writings, which he could any way reconcile to the doctrine of Chriſt, he looked upon as a portion of divine wiſdom which chriſtians might juſtly appropriate to themſelves. And ſome of the heathen philoſophers made uſe of artifice to corrupt the chriſtian doctrines, blending them with their own, and ſo prevented many from leaving them for chriſtianity, and ſpoilt many chriſtians through philoſophy and vain deceit. And the effects thereof continue to this day in ſome of the leading articles of the reputed orthodox chriſtian faith. The writer of the following ſheets hath purſued a popular manner, agreeably to the character of the holy ſcriptures, in treating of the ſubjects which come under his conſideration. He hath diſcarded all human authority, and appealed to inſpiration only, as the ſenſe of it is judged of by reaſon and the analogy of things, if his ideas are right with theſe, he is unconcerned whether they are new or old. He venerates the *piety* of the Fathers, and is thankful for any aſſiſtance from them, but will not ſubſcribe to their infallibility. He hath aimed to ſteer his courſe between the errors of reputed orthodoxy, and hereſy, the Scylla and Charybdis of divinity, finding repugnances to

truth on both ſides. In his ſtile and language, he hath made uſe of ſome compound words, as no others expreſſed his idea: one in particular, *creature-tranſcendant*, is more definitive than the word *divine*, becauſe a perſon may be divine by a participation of the divine nature and in other reſpects a creature alſo, as holy angels and ſaints are, but only the Chriſtian Trinity, are all divine, or creature-tranſcendant. He hath kept St. Auguſtine's words in view, "*mallem reprehendent grammatici, quam non intelligant populi*: I had rather grammarians ſhould fault me, than people not underſtand me. St. Paul was of the ſame mind as to people's underſtanding him. I. Cor. xiv. 19. As the author denies infallibility, to others he doth not arrogate it to himſelf. He hath long thought that ſomething, tending to give a clear, comprehenſive and conſiſtent view of the theory of religion might be uſeful, and hath waited to ſee ſome *abler* writer undertake it, but none hath done it, as he hath ſeen. It is the opinion of the author that much of the oppoſition to revelation ariſes from not underſtanding it, owing to the partial or wrong views that have been given of it. Whether this theory will any ways counteract this evil, the event, muſt ſhew. One evil it is hoped will be deſtroyed, the avoiding that *Baalzebub of ſins*, even the making any other rule of faith, than reaſon, ſcripture, common faith, and the analogy of things. The author's earneſt prayer to the Father of light, and he wiſhes others to join in it, is, that divine truth, and its unfailing attendant charity, may have a more diffuſive ſpread, and that the whole earth may be filled with the unadulterated knowledge of God and his word; and that divine love and philanthropy may poſſeſs and actuate every human breaſt. And ſince in this imperfect ſtate, we all know but in part, let none content themſelves with preſent attainments but aſpire after the greateſt attainments now poſſible, and be gradually progreſſing towards, the perfection attainable in the future ſcenes of things where there will be a direct view without the interpoſition of any obſtructing medium, and a full diſcovery of the wiſdom, benevolence, and grace of God, and of all his ways towards the whole of his creation, but eſpecially towards that noble, and highly favored part, his human *offspring*.

A

# THEORETIC EXPLANATION

OF THE

# SCIENCE OF SANCTITY.

THE SCIENCE OF SANCTITY is that "knowledge of the holy which is underſtanding." Prov. ix. 10. It juſtly merits the preference to all other ſciences in importance and utility, when the objects it is converſant about, and the concern and intereſt every individual hath in it, are conſidered. This ſpecies of learning can only be acquired by the ſtudy of the volumes of nature, and of revelation, as explained by reaſon, common ſenſe, and the analogy of things. The works of nature, and things earthly, being only figures and patterns of things ſpiritual and heavenly, the ſaving knowledge of the truth is not attainable by the ſtudy of the book of nature alone, yet an attentive peruſal of it will contribute much thereunto, if the *ſpecific difference* between theſe kinds of things is carefully attended to and obſerved. The foundation principle of this holy ſcience, is the true knowledge of the only true GOD. That ſuch a being doth exiſt hath been validly proved by many learned writers, nor is it denied by any but the Pſalmiſt's *fool*, and he ſeems rather to have wiſhed for none, than to have firmly believed there was none. But there is a

ſenſe in which the owners of the exiſtence of a Deity may be *a theoi, atheiſts*, or *without God*, and not know him that is the true God, nor worſhip him in his true character, but *worſhip they know not what*, as the Samaritans did, even though they received as canonical, the five books of Moſes, and intentionally terminated their worſhip on the true God. John iv. 19. God hath been repreſented by ſome as *unknowable*, and by others a wrong idea hath been given of him. But he is unknown only by the wicked; *holy people do know* their God, and to know the *only true God*, is ſaid, by him that *declared* him, *to be life eternal unto men*.

## CHAP. I.

### AN IDEA OF GOD.

*GOD is definitively the Divine Majeſty actually reigning and exerciſing imperial ſway over the univerſe of creatures.* Rev. xix. 6. Pſ. xcvii. 1. xcix. 1.

This is an exact and regular definition of him. The calling him a moſt *perfect eſſence*, a *pure mind*, or *intelligence*, is not expreſſive or determinate; and even the appellations of the Supreme Being, or the *greateſt*, *beſt*, and *wiſeſt* Being, do not ſhew *who*, and *what* he is. An eſſence is no being, but the conſtitutive property of one; and the moſt *perfect being* is *laudatory*, but not *definitive*. The above definition imports,

1. That God is one ſingular perſon, according to the common definition of a perſon, *even a diſtinct individual intellectualiſt, with an individual ſubſtance for his life or nature.*

Neither reaſon, revelation, nor common ſenſe admit of more than one Divine Majeſty, or King, having one underſtanding,

mind, will, *eternal power* (potentacy) *and godhead.* Rom. i. 20. A King and God muſt be a perſon; and to conſtitute perſonality there muſt be intellectuality. But there cannot be two intellects in one perſon, being, or God, without deſtroying his individuality. The terms God, Father, Being, Jehovah, King, &c. never ſignify more than one intellectualiſt, or intelligent agent. One Being, God, or Father, can have but one intellect, and a *perſon* cannot have leſs than one, and one intellect can conſtitute but one intellectualiſt, or intelligent agent. A *triune* Jehovah, *three one* God, Being, King, Father, &c. is as much a contradiction, as a *three unit* in arithmetic, and is a plain repugnance to reaſon and to the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, and even to common ſenſe, when men ſuffer themſelves to exerciſe it. Deut. vi. 45. I. Cor. viii. 4. Gal. iii. 20. I. Tim. ii. 5. It is to one ſingular *eis*, perſonal God, certain perfections, operations and works are aſcribed, and not to any *eſſence*, which is no being, but the property of one, or the vital ſubſtance of a perſon, nor to any *three one* Jehovah, King, God, or Being.

2. The above definition imports God to be a perſon of eminency or dignity. This is ſo common a notion of God, that whenever men think of him, their mind reacheth at ſomething, than which there is nothing higher, or more ſublime. The Hebrews often uſe the term God for the ſuperlative degree. In the Greek, Moſes is ſaid to be *fair as God.* Acts vii. 20. *Cedars of God*, are the higheſt cedars. St. Auguſtine called the Deity, the *Supreme Great*, or *Great Supreme.*

3. God, as the divine majeſty, is tranſcendent to creatures. Creatures may be denominated, and really be, divine, by a participation of the *divine nature*, as holy angels, and the regenerate are; or by reaſon of their *ſtate*, as *thrones* among angels, and *rulers* among men: but God is creator, tranſcendent in *nature* and *ſtate.* In the univerſe, there are God,

and creatures, and nothing elſe: God is uncreated, and exiſts by neceſſity of nature without any manner of cauſation; but all that is not God is created. The Creator muſt be of ſuperior dignity to the creature, and of another *ſpecies* of being. But as there may be *eminency* without authority, and a *degree* of divinity of nature, and of ſtate, where no religious ſubjection is due;

4. Therefore, the full idea of God is that of the Divine Majeſty, poſſeſſed of, and actually exerciſing imperial ſway over the univerſe of creatures.

Every idea of the Deity ſhort of the divine ſovereignty, is defective, and infers no obligation to religious worſhip. If God is not King, the enquiry, "Who is Lord over us?" hath no anſwer. Theos, in Greek, which anſwers to the Hebrew El, Eloah, Elohim, which are tranſlated God, denote ſovereignty and dominion, as the learned Grotius juſtly obſerves. Dr. Hammond ſaith, "The title God, is ſufficiently known from his ſupreme power over all." The Jews alſo inform us, He is called Elohim, becauſe he is Lord and Judge of all gods. Judges and other rulers are called Elohim, and even Moſes was an Elohim to Pharaoh, but certainly not a trinity. Exod. xxii. 28. Comp. Acts xxiii. 3. Pſ. lxxxii. 1. Exod. vii. 1. The name of God denotes, that he is of imperial condition, and the moſt high, therefore rulers as ſuch are ſons of the moſt high. In ſcripture, Lord, God, and King, are applied to the Deity as ſynonymous. I. Tim. i. 17. His eternal power (potentacy) and godhead are the ſame. Rom. i. 20. To the idea of highneſs or moſt high which all men have of God, *ſupremacy* of *rule*, muſt ever be joined. This is what induces the obligation of religion. A mere nature, mind, or ſpirit, is no object of worſhip, nor even a creator, if he is not Lord and King alſo. Whatever vital, or perſonal perfections, the Deity may be ſuppoſed poſſeſſed of; however infinite and perfect his being

and underſtanding may be; or holy and boundleſs his nature; if he is not their king, lawgiver, and judge, men are under no obligation to be religious towards him. The ſcripture titles and doxologies all import him to be an imperial perſon, and holy men in their devotional addreſſes conſider him as equally their King, as God. The anſwer, in a well known catechiſm, to "What is God?" "God is *a* ſpirit," &c. lays no foundation for worſhip, as no ſovereignty over us, or propriety in us, is expreſſed, as a reaſon or ground of ſuch worſhip; and beſides the text referred to is not, *God is a Spirit*, but *God is Spirit*, without an article ſignificative of his nature, and character, and not of his immateriality which doth not diſtinguiſh him from evil ſpirits only in *degree*. John iv. 24. The immateriality and incorporiety of God are no where expreſſed in ſcripture; and as our worſhip muſt be like its object, ſuch an idea would exclude all bodily ſervice. In prefacing the ten commandments, God is not ſtyled Jehovah, but Elohim; the former denotes the verity of his being, the latter his imperial authority, a point that muſt firſt be eſtabliſhed in enacting laws of religion. Sovereign ſtates therefore declare their authority in the preamble to their acts. God declares his legiſlative power thus, "I am the Lord," or "thus ſaith the Lord." The law determining who ſhall rule, and who be ſubject, is fundamental. Upon the declaration "I am the Lord," the authority of all the commandments depends.

The above idea of the Deity, as the Lord God omnipotent who reigneth, not only expreſſeth his *gradual* ſupremacy over all beings and things, but his *natural* and *ſpecific* difference from all creatures.

There are two differences in the *ſtates* of beings, *reigning*, and *ſubjection*, or *independency*, and *dependency*: there are but two alſo in the *natures* of beings, viz. *uncreated*, and *created*. The former belongs to God, who is therefore not only in ſtate, but nature, tranſcendent to all creatures. The derivation of

divinity of ſtate, and nature, to creatures, deifies them ſo far as they are communicated; but creatures may exiſt without them, whereas God is the only potentate by neceſſity of being, and he only is neceſſarily, originally, and abſolutely holy, that is God in ſtate and nature.

Conſidering God as the divine majeſty, he, like other ſupreme potentates, muſt be contemplated as a ſovereignty, or imperial eſtate, in both the *perſonal* and *real* acceptation. When St. John ſaith, "*The whole world lieth in wickedneſs,*" or in the wicked one, it is not to be underſtood perſonally, but *imperſonally*. Thus the godhead is noticed as an imperſonal ſovereignty, when men are ſaid to be *without God*, or *to be, abide* and *dwell* in him, that is in his divine ſovereignty or kingdom eſtate.

The idea of God, as the divine majeſty, implies that the name God, as well as Lord, and King, is a name of *honor* in general, and not of an eſſence, or nature, which is no perſonal agent. A perſon of honor and nobility even among Pagans was reputed *divine*. In ſcripture, which treats of that branch of nobility learning called *titles of honor*, the names God, ſon, or ſons, and children of God, are expreſſive of honor and nobility. God is a perſon of *honor*. In the temple his *honor* (perſon) dwelt, and it was the habitation of his (perſonal) holineſs. Thus ſome profanely call the Pope his holineſs, and perſons of dignity and authority, are called your highneſs, your excellency, your worſhip, and even your majeſty. The fathers call chriſtians, the *adoptive nobility, the divine offspring*. A king is reputed the fountain of ſecular honor, and the ſame is true of every ſupreme ruler, and the glory of the kingdom is the ſummit of worldly honor: much more is God the head, fountain and utmoſt height of divine nobility, honor, and glory.

Again, the name of God is ſuch a title of honor as ſignifies a dignity of eſtate,

St. Paul calls Felix *moſt noble*, as governor. God is divinely noble, and excellent as the ſupreme potentate.

This name God is to be ranked among ſuperior dignities: it is the crown dignity. Chriſt, for diſcharging an office well, was rewarded with an honorary dignity, by being *crowned with glory and honor.* Heb. xi. 19. *His name above every name*, is that of God. Jeſus at his birth was by *nature* and *dignity* God as a ſon and heir: but at his exaltation he was in *ſtate* God, which is the name above every name, the father alone excepted.

The name God ſignifies ſuch a divine honor of eſtate over creatures as a king doth a dignity of eſtate over ſubjects.

But this great name God, as applied to the divine majeſty, imports ſuch an honor as is a *religious kind of honor*, perſonally, and objectively.

To be a God, Sebaſma, Numen, devotion, and object of worſhip, are the ſame. "All that is called God, or is worſhipped." II. Theſſ. xi. 4. "Your devotions," Acts xvii. 23, are not their devotional acts, but honors, worſhips, or objects. The title of *your worſhip* attributed to a magiſtrate who is in ſtate God, ſignifies that perſon of honor who is the object of the act of civil worſhip or devotion. It is as eſſential to God to be the object of the creature's divine worſhip, as it is to a king to be the object of his ſubjects' civil worſhip. There is no middle being between God and creatures, and therefore there can be no middle worſhip of the religious kind that is not divine. Thus God is infinitely above all creatures in ſtate: Iſa. xl. 14, and he is equally tranſcendent in nature as the living God, having life in himſelf of himſelf, and as being impeccable, infallible, immortal, incorruptible, all wiſe, holy, &c. The great Jehovah never did, nor can die.

*Having aſſerted the tranſcendency of God to all creatures in his* nature, *it is needful to inquire and ſhew wherein the divine* nature *conſiſts.*

*By a nature, and life, the ſame thing is to be underſtood, and it is the ſpecific property of a thing, the vital ſubſtance of a being, which conſtitutes, and denominates it, and diſtinguiſheth one being from all others of another kind.*

It is not therefore a being, perſon, or agent of itſelf, nor hath it any exiſtence but in relation to the ſubject to which it belongs. To aſcribe perſonal acts to a nature, or to ſpeak of worſhipping the divine nature, however common, is a real impropriety and manifeſt abſurdity. As there are ſeveral ſpecies of beings, each kind hath its own nature, which conſtitutes it, and differenceth it from another. The nature of one being is common to the whole *kind*. There are not two kinds of the human nature, or of the divine, how many millions ſoever partake of each. When Dr. Tillotſon, on II. Pet. i. 4. ſpeaks of our partaking of *a* divine nature, he falls into a manifeſt impropriety, as it imports that there may be more than *one* divine nature. With equal propriety he might ſpeak of partaking of *a* human nature, as if there were ſeveral kinds of human nature. In this he hath been implicitly followed by many through inattention, or for want of a habit of thinking. But the truth of fact is that there is ſpecifically but one divine, as there is but one human nature. "He that ſanctifieth, and they who are ſanctified, are all of one." Heb. xi. 11. Saints as ſaints are one with God and Chriſt by a participation of the divine nature. John xvii. 21. 22. It is an eſſential oneneſs, if nature and eſſence are the ſame; but if eſſence ſignifies ſomething different from nature, as it is no ſcripture word, Thomas Aquinas, or any one elſe may have it. Conſidering the Deity as the fountain of vitality and a parental providence, "in him we live and move and have our being." Acts xvii. 28. Here is a natural oneneſs, and in holy beings there is a ſpiritual or divine oneneſs, for holineſs or ſanctity is divinity, or eternal and divine life. One perſon or being may have more than one nature, but

one perſonal agent, or being, cannot have more than one intellect without deſtroying his individuality. In men there are two natures, an animal nature of fleſh and blood, common to them and beaſts, and a rational ſoul with its vital ſubſtance, wherein humanity properly conſiſts; and in regenerate chriſtians the divine nature is added to theſe, and yet there is but one individual perſonality, as there is but one intellect.

Nature ſignifies an innate diſpoſition or conſtitution. It is the innate property of ſome creatures to be ſavage, ferocious, and poiſonous, and of others to be harmleſs, meek and innocuous; a harmleſs wolf is as contrary to nature as a ſavage lamb. Some plants are wild by nature, and for theſe to be grafted into a good olive-tree is *contrary to nature*. Rom. xi. 24. All things, creatures, and beings, have their conſtitutive natures, and that courſe of acts which is according thereunto is natural.

Nature may be conſidered as the *ſum, comprehenſion*, or *totality* of ſuch innate properties as are merely vital. Such a nature is animative, and is found in all vital beings, who act by *inſtinct*. In ſuch a nature there are *ſympathies* and *antipathies*, as between a wolf and a ſheep, without the exerciſe of reaſon or deliberation. This nature is a live impetus, ſelf-moving propenſion without being externally driven. It is like a living fountain from whence iſſue living ſtreams; or the heart which dilateth and contracteth itſelf and pours out blood through the whole body, by an innate ſelf moving power which is its innate conſtitution. A nature like this is a principle of free motion, acts with eaſe what is connatural, as men perform the natural acts and functions of life with facility. It is alſo a fixed permanent principle, for to change nature is difficult.

Such a nature directed by an intellect will ever operate, and produce correſpondent effects, where there is no prevailing obſtruction or impediment.

By a nature as applied to God is not intended his metaphyſical entity as the firſt Being, nor his mere intellectuality. Theſe conſtitute no *ſpecific* difference, but only what is *gradual*, between him and other beings or intellectualiſts. Being or exiſtence in any degree is no more the divine nature than Behemoth partakes of the divine nature becauſe he is great. Creatures may exiſt, be inviſible, incorruptible, intelligent and immortal in *a degree*, and not partake of the divine nature. Benevolence to being, as being, is no more holineſs than being as being is God. A very wicked agent may have a good being, and great degrees of exiſtence.

The divine nature is that whereby God is God. It is his life and conſtitution; it is *vital*, *true ſanctity*, *holineſs*, *ſpirit*, *light*, *love* and *eternal life*. II. Pet. i. 4. Heb. xii. 10. John iv. 24. I. John iv. 16. I. John i. 5. Unbounded ſanctity is the vital ſubſtance in which the infinite intellect of God exiſts. *That which is born of the ſpirit is ſpirit*. Sanctity is nature in God, but grace in the regenerate.

*His* ſpecific nature as God, and *theirs* as ſaints, is a vital nature, abhorrent from impurity, by an innate antipathy, *light without any darkneſs at all; love without any hatred*. Fleſh born of fleſh is a vital nature, ſpontaneouſly parturient of ſin, in which there dwelleth no good thing, it luſteth againſt the ſpirit and inclineth to evil; but the divine nature is ſpirit luſting againſt the fleſh, and inclines to what is holy by an innate inſtinctive propenſion.

The holineſs of God which is his vital, perſonal, and imperial glory, may be conſidered as a *nature*, as an *exerciſe or act*, and a *dignity*.

Holineſs of purity belongs to his *nature* and life, and holineſs of dignity to his *ſtate*, and in both he is glorious, magnificent in holineſs: The infinitely holy one, and he only, is holy, as he only is God, in the original ſupreme ſenſe.

Divinity of nature is creature tranſcendent, that is ſuperhuman and ſupra-angelical.

The unregenerate partake of the human nature, as truly as the regenerate, and devils are of the angelical nature as really as the holy angels are, and of as great natural and intellectual abilities. There may be a goodneſs of nature phyſically conſidered, in the worſt beings morally. The beſt good human nature among heathen, did not prevent their murdering by thouſands thoſe chriſtians, for whom the *divine love nature* would have engaged them to die. When angels and men may exiſt without the divine nature, it is the eternal life of God. The divine nature is pure good nature without any mixture of evil nature, moſt beautiful and lovely, moſt peaceable, joyous, and comfortable, moſt noble, honorable and glorious.

5. The name God as expreſſed by the divine majeſty imports him to be *politically* and *ſocietively*, the intrinſic vital *head*, and *God-head* of an holy empire, or kingdom appropriately his own and divine.

This compleats the idea of God, and comprehends all his vital, perſonal, and imperial perfections, and alſo denotes his kingdom to be the region of light, love, and eternal life. He is no intrinſic, vital, imperial head, or God-head, to the univerſe at large in its preſent divided ſtate. He is not in *fact* th God of *this world* in a divine political ſenſe; the univerſe is not one *whole*, compoſing the kingdom, city, or houſe of God. The illuſtration of this part of the idea of God is of great importance, becauſe the whole truth of revelation reſts upon it, and alſo as common ſyſtems of theology mention it not, unleſs it be to oppoſe it.

God being a divine ſovereign over the univerſe of creatures is of *right* their imperial eſtate and God-head.

This implies that all rationals were *originally*, and *now ought to be*, in a ſociety, or theopolity of which God is the intrinſic, vital, and imperial head. This was the original ſtate of the rational creation in the *kingdom of God all in all*. It

cannot be rationally ſuppoſed that God at firſt created any rationals out of ſociety with *himſelf*, or unfit for ſuch ſociety, by an alienation from his life, or in a ſtate of rebellion to his government.

The firſt eſtate of angels and the ſpirits of men was not without God's kingdom, for that is hell; but *their own habitation* was in heaven, unleſs there can be found a place in God's creation that is neither heaven nor hell, within or without his kingdom. But this is not in fact the preſent ſtate of the rational moral univerſe, however it came to paſs. Beings and things are divided, and revelation tells us ſome angels *ſinned, abode not in the truth, kept not their firſt eſtate, but left their own habitation*; and that under a certain chieftain who is by uſurpation the god of this world, they compoſe a kingdom oppoſite to the kingdom of God. To this kingdom of evil the other order of rationals, the ſpirits of men, now belong, and remain, until born again into the kingdom of God. John viii. 44. II. Pet. ii. 4. Jude 6. II. Cor. iv. 3. *The whole world lieth in wickedneſs*, or *the wicked one*. I. John v. 19. It is in wickedneſs as an intoxicated perſon is *in drink*; and its *lying* in it expreſſeth its abiding poſture. To be *without God*, and *in the world* are the ſame, conſidering the world as a polity oppoſed to the kingdom of God, and of Chriſt, *which is not of the world*. Eph. ii. 12. John xviii. 36. None but holy angels kept their ſtanding, and *they* and the *reſtored of men* are of God; others are without God, aliens, ſtrangers, and foreigners, and God is an *extra ſocietive* head to them. The Deity is the *God of the ſpirits of all fleſh*, phyſically conſidered, and as a parental providence all *live, move, and have their being in him*; he is alſo *king of nations* in a civil moral ſenſe; all *of right* are his ſubjects, but he is only the King and God of *ſaints* in a ſpiritual religious ſenſe. The true God is the deity of the true religion, of which the holy empire is the region, and true religioniſts the

ſubjects. As the Jews who uſed the Greek tongue were termed helleniſts, and were ſaid to hellenize; ſo they who are of God are *theiſts*, and *theize*, and the comprehenſion, or ſum total of their peculiarities, may be termed *theiſm* of religion and condition. Thus in philoſophy there are ſeveral of theſe *ſpecific comprehenſions*, as platoniſm, epicuriſm, &c. ſo are there in religion, as paganiſm, judaiſm, chriſtianiſm, calviniſm, &c. The religion which is of God is *theiſm*, true ſanctity of religion; this founded his holy kingdom, and all who are of God, are in *that, in God*, that is, are in that ſpecific comprehenſion of things he is of, and ſymbolize with him; he is the Father of their family, of whom it is named.

This is an idea of God the heathen were unacquainted with, and many chriſtians ſeem to be ignorant of it, but every *body* of divinity is without a *ſoul* that wants it. There are ſeveral kingdoms in the world, each of its proper *kind*, divine, chriſtian, human, diabolical, worldly and heavenly, and the heads and ſubjects of them are of *like kind*. The Pope, by his votaries, is conſidered as the head of a papal empire, formed by a ſpecies of religion; his ſubjects conſort with him, and are animated by the ſpirit of Popery. He cannot be the intrinſic head of a proteſtant empire that doth not own him or his religion. The king of England is conſidered as the head, not only of the civil ſtate, but of the church; diſſenters own him to be their head in the former capacity, but not in the latter; as religioniſt, he is not their intrinſic head. Thus God is the head of a religion of his kind, which religion is the inſtitution of a polity, his religion which is ſanctity makes it a polity, a kingdom of ſaints, and He is an intrinſic vital ſocietive head to it, the holy kind of God, and king of it, and all real ſubjects are in a degree partakers of the divine nature, live in God, are one with him, and their works are wrought in God, as animated by the ſpirit of God. God

indeed as *king of nations* is the author of a religion which is of this world, where only nations as ſuch exiſt; this religion is *civil religious*, even the moral law, as of *civil religious* interpretation. Such was the Moſaic moral law in the letter of it, a *this world religion*, with *a worldly ſanctuary*, Heb. ix. 1. 15. but had no promiſe of eternal inheritance.

God is the civil religious head of other nations, whoſe conſtitution is founded according to his ordinance, upon the baſis of the moral law, which is the law of nations in their politic capacity, ſo far as it is promulged to them. It was only a belief in the promiſe to which the law was added, that conſtituted a Jew the ſubject of God as king of ſaints, and a citizen of heaven. God cannot be the intrinſic holy vital head of any other kingdom than of ſaints, any more than Chriſt can be the intrinſic vital head of an unchriſtian, or antichriſtian body. But as this part of the theory deſerves a fuller illuſtration, the following muſt be attended to.

Firſt. *An explanation of the titles of Lord and King as belonging to the divine majeſty, with a brief account of ſome of the prerogatives of his ſovereignty.*

Secondly. *Over whom and in what manner the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.*

*Firſt.* As to the titles of Lord and King as belonging to the divine majeſty, and the prerogatives of his ſovereignty or imperial eſtate.

Lord and God are of near affinity, and are often joined in ſcripture. In a civil law ſenſe, a Lord is a ſuperior proprietor of things and perſons. Math. xx. 8. Gen. xxxi. 35. As *poſſeſſor*, God is Lord of heaven and earth and all things in them. Governing powers of the natural and legal kind are Lords who have a kind of propriety in thoſe to whom they ſtand in this relation. I. Pet. iii. 6.

But an authoritive Lord is one that *beareth rule*, and is ſo far *unſubject*. To the civil ſovereignty, whether lodged in one or more perſons, the law attributes a public *lordſhip*, conſiſting in the great and ſupreme rights of government. The ſubjects of a legal lord are his lieges, and between him and them there ſubſiſts a mutual obligation even where no formal contract is made. In nobility learning, which treats of titles of honor, the greater dominant eſtates are lords. Jud. xvi. 8. God as Lord is of dominant condition over the univerſe, as a ſupreme authoritative power, *panto crator*, *all imperial*, and a liege lord to his liege ſubjects.

God is KING.

This is of great note in the bible, though it is diſregarded by many divines, and not accounted of in moſt ſyſtems, but conſidered as a metaphor when it comes in their way. But He is no otherwiſe *God* than he is *King*. I. Tim. i. 17.

Any dominant condition over things and perſons is *reigning*, as the reign of *ſin* and *death* over men. But reigning properly belongs to ſupreme powers. Death is the *king*, becauſe *chief* of terrors. Lord and king are much alike in ſcripture; and the kingdom, eſtate and dominion of God are the ſame. Pſ. cxlv. 13. I. Chron. xxix. 11. God's people call him the Lord the King, the King of glory, the King over all the earth.

The kingſhip of God imports a reigning condition or eſtate; to this agrees the titles of the moſt High, the ſupreme Potentate, Power, &c. Goodneſs, greatneſs, glory, belong to him as a perſon of regal dignity. The reigning eſtate, is the *ſublimity* of the godhead, the *ſummity* of the divine ſupremacy, the *dignity* of the *peerleſs ſupereminency*, and *tranſcendency of God*.

All the glories of empire and the prerogatives of ſovereignty belong to God in the fulleſt ſenſe.

The Godhead eſtate is a magnificent reigning eſtate; and to

do any thing *royally* is to act like a king. II. Sam. xxiv. 23. A polity though monarchical may be too small for a kingdom, and so *prosper into a kingdom.* Ezek. xvi. 13.

The kingdom estate of God is unabject, unsubject: He hath no equal. *That God is greater than man*, was a great truth to the orientals who deified their princes. Job xxxiii. 12.

This is a royal sublimity of condition, to whom belongs the greatness, power, glory, majesty, kingdom, victory, riches, honor. He is exalted as head above all. I. Chron. xxix. 12. In nobility learning the king is the fountain of secular honor.

The imperial lawyers call the emperor the first of the nobility. God is the *fountain* of divine honor, the prime of divine nobility. All comes of him, and to him all is ascribed.

The Godhead as reigning is the height of glory. Ezek. iii. 12. Isa. iii. 8. By the Schekinah the Jews understand the divine majestatic glory. Secular rulers are *doxai*, glories. I. Pet. i. 18. original. The kingdom estate is the *glory;* restless ambition can climb no higher than to the kingdom. The glory of the blessed God is unsullied, and is the peerless supereminence of his unrivalled dominion and power.

When Christ came into his kingdom, He was *crowned with glory and honor.*

The Godhead as reigning is the height of prosperity, felicity, and beatitude. He is the happy God. I. Tim. i. 11. original. None can exact upon him at all. Isocrates saith, "All men confess the kingdom to be the most resplendent of all goods human and divine." This well applies to God as reigning.

The estate of God, as reigning, is the supremacy of rule and government. The name of King doth not properly belong to subject, dependent princes. As a matter of eminency, *the woman reigneth over the kings of the earth.* Rev. xvii. 18. As a matter of office, *by wisdom kings reign.* Prov. viii. 18. Plato calls the science of ruling well, the *regal science.* It

belongs to the officiary dignity of a king, in ſociety with liege people, to adminiſter wiſe, good, happy government, enact good laws, execute judgment, diſtribute due rewards and puniſhments, protect his ſubjects, ſubdue their enemies, eſtabliſh peace, promote piety. Such is the government of God. He is a father, friend, ſtate phyſician, and benefactor to his people.

God's *eminency of rule*, muſt be diſtinguiſhed from his *officiary dignity* of King over liege ſubjects. In the former ſenſe, He reigneth over *devils* and the wicked, but in the latter over ſaints only. "We are *thine*: thou never beareſt rule over them; they were not called by thy name." Iſa. lxiii. 19. But God is no tyrant or arbitrary deſpot to his enemies; he puniſhes only to teſtify his regard to public juſtice, and to benefit the ſubject, or others.

In a word the kingdom and reigning eſtate of God is the height of power, puiſſance, and of all divine immunities, liberties, franchiſes and prerogatives. To him belongs legiſlative and deciſive power without appeal, executive power, the power of the ſword, of life and death, of pardoning criminals, creating thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers, of making officers, of war and peace. All theſe branches of power belong to the divine King originally, and are derivatives from *him* to ſuch as lawfully exerciſe them in any degree, and not from *electors*, who only *deſignate* the perſons, as the woman chooſes the man who ſhall rule her under God, according to his ordinance and law.

The immunities of earthly kings are juſtly great, and ſome have claimed what doth not belong to them. To make a man's father's houſe *free*, was a great ennoblement. I. Sam. xvii. 25. The children of a king are *free*. Mat. xvii. 26. But God is abſolutely free, accountable to none, and independent of all. He cannot *err*, *ſin*, *do wrong*, or be chargeable with any imperfection, or liable to any inconveniency.

There is one prerogative kings claim, which muſt be inquired into, to ſee how far it belongs to God, viz. *diſobligedneſs from the laws.*

A ſupreme legiſlator as ſuch, is held not to be ſubject to the law of his own making, becauſe a law is the impoſition of a ſuperior, which he cannot have and be ſupreme.

In human governments there are conſtitutions which kings *conſent* to when inveſted in office; theſe they muſt obey ſo far as there is the ſame *reaſon* for them and others. The leader in muſic muſt obſerve the ſame rules that others do, not as a learner but teacher; the nature of things makes the rule or law. And thus God, though under law to no ſuperior, is a law to himſelf. He can only do what is juſt, right, and equal, and nothing elſe is agreeable *to the counſel of his own will.* Infinite underſtanding, perfect wiſdom, and rectitude, direct the divine ſovereignty in all his operations. He conſiders creatures as having rights, which he doth not invade. Not being, if it may be ſo expreſſed, hath a right to continue in non-exiſtence, if its given being is not beneficial. God treats creatures according to what they are, made none of them to be miſerable, nor doth he neceſſitate the miſery of any, for his own, ſuppoſed, glory. God's original creation made not evil; it founded a kingdom of ſaints under law, with liberty; He lives the law of that city in conſort with his ſubjects, not as under a ſuperior, but as ever diſpoſed to do what is right in itſelf. "Juſt and true are all the ways of the king of ſaints."

Sacredneſs and inviolability belong to the divine majeſty as reigning. Theſe prerogatives have been claimed by kings. When the Roman emperor was crowned, the patriarch of Conſtantinople, upon pouring the oil on his head, cried, *ſacred.* The German empire is termed ſacred, and the emperor's title is *His Sacred Majeſty.* The ambaſſadors of kings have been held ſacred. God is infinitely ſacred, as ſacredneſs is the ſanc-

*tity*, or inviolableneſs of things and perſons. He is ſacred and inviolable in his perſon, life, and ſtate. To deſecrate or alienate what is His, is *ſacrilege*.

The Godhead is a monarchy or ſingularity of rule in one perſon as ſupreme.

The ſuppoſition of three ſupremes or chief rulers is a contradiction, and a three-one Majeſty, or King, or God, is no better. There is but one perſonal God, *of whom are all things*; one autotheos, God of himſelf or from none. The unity of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, in nature and ſovereignty, doth not conſtitute them one God, King, or Lord, for that would be the ſame as three perſonal agents being one perſonal agent; nor doth their *ſameneſs in nature*, make them *equal in ſtate*.

The Father alone is the ſole monarch of the univerſe, who as he exiſts by neceſſity of nature, ſo he reigns as having all power in himſelf, originally, underivedly, ſupremely, abſolutely, and independently.

*Laſtly*. The reigning eſtate of God is divinity or creature-tranſcendency of condition, abſolutely and originally.

The nature and ſtate of God are diſtinguiſhable, though both are creature-tranſcendent. Perſons who are creatures may partake of the divine nature in a degree, and not be divine in ſtate. And even the Son and Holy Ghoſt, whom it will be proved are divine by nature, were not divine by ſtate at *all times*, and *equal* with the one God the Father, the alone ſelf exiſtent fountain of divine life and power.

All creatures who partake of the divine nature, are divine by *nature*, in a degree proportioned to the meaſures of ſuch participation; but they are not in *ſtate* divine, unleſs their condition is *reigning* alſo. When the only begotten Son lay in the manger, he was as truly and really divine by *nature*, as he is now in heaven at his Father's right hand, but he was not in

*ſtate* God until his exaltation commenced at his reſurrection, nor was *all power given* him in heaven and on earth. Some creatures have a degree of divinity of *ſtate*, though not divine by nature, as magiſtrates and ſons of the Moſt High. Some are divine by *nature*, but not by ſtate, as the regenerate are. And ſome are divine by nature and ſtate, as thrones and dominions among angels. But there is no divinity of nature or ſtate in any perſon, only as it is derived from the divine Majeſty as the fountain, or belongs to them becauſe of their peculiar relation to him. Mere divinity of nature is not a ground of religious worſhip any more than humanity of nature is a ground of civil worſhip. Who ever heard of worſhipping the human nature when addreſſing an earthly king? there muſt be divinity of ſtate founded on divinity of nature, and a command from God to warrant divine worſhip. As divinity of ſtate added to humanity of nature is the ſuper-eminence of an earthly king, ſo divinity of ſtate as added to divinity of nature is the ſuper-eminence of *deity*, the dignity of the divine tranſcendency, the ſupreme ſupremacy of *Godhead*. To this ſtate the Son of God is now exalted, crowned with glory and honor, and is God over all, the Father alone excepted, whoſe divinity of ſtate and nature, are creature-tranſcendencies, by abſolute neceſſity.

Secondly. *Over whom, and how the divine Majeſty exerciſeth his creature-tranſcendent ſovereignty, and reign, is now to be ſhewn.*

*In point of* eminency, and underived right, *God reigneth over all beings and things; his dominion is coextended with creation and founded on it. He is alſo of* right *God and King of all rationals, and they* ought *all to be his liege ſubjects; but in* fact *and in a way of* officiary dignity, *he is* king *of ſaints only, and his kingdom is not of this world, but of heaven.*

The above diſtinctions are important and need illuſtration.

1. In reſpect of eminency, God is the ſovereign potentate of all potentates, angelical, human, and diabolical.

This gradual ſupremacy of God is thus expreſſed in ſcripture, King of kings, Lord of lords, God of gods. All lawful authority is derivatively from him in every mode of its conveyance. He is God of all the kingdoms of the earth; Governor among the nations; the Moſt High who ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whom he pleaſeth, promotes, ſets up, and pulls down whom he will. Natural government of parents over children, and of huſbands over wives, is his ordinance, and the juſt authority in each is from him, and not from the ſubject party by their conſent or election: So alſo is civil government God's ordinance as King of nations, and all lawful civil authority and power is derived from God.

Rulers are God's miniſters for the public good, as ſubordinate to, and connected with, the honor of the ſupreme King. Neither rulers have any *rights*, nor *people any privileges, or liberty*, incompatible with the rights, and repugnant to the law of God.

Eccleſiaſtical authority reſts upon the ſame baſis, only the Deity, as the fountain of it, is King of *ſaints*. Not the leaſt degree of power is derived from the *fraternity*, or *members* of the church, but all is from Chriſt the Head as he received it from the Father. Matth. xxviii. 18, 19. Right and authority, privilege and power, in natural, conjugal, civil and eccleſiaſtical reſpects, are diſtinct and inconvertible the one into the other, and are derived from God as their *ſource*.

All angelical power is from him as ſupreme, who is exalted as *head* above all. And even Satan's dominion and godſhip over this world is not without his permiſſion, and is ſubject to his control, and will at laſt be put down. All lawful authority is God's miniſterially: and unlawful power is by permiſſion, ſubject to his control, and will be deſtroyed from his creation, and *God be all in all*. An ancient writer ſaith, "There is one Ruler, Prince, and King, to whom it belongs to govern and

adminiſter all things." Another ſaith, "One muſt neceſſarily be the maker and lord of one creation."

Again, "The ſupremacy belongs to one, whoſe dominion is a monarchy." The heathen plead for a kind of monarchy, yet Lactantius juſtly obſerves, "That in a proper monarchy all potentacy muſt neceſſarily reſide in one by whom all are governed." True religion is the doctrine of one God over all, in oppoſition to the pagan polyarchy, and the triune deity of ſcholaſtics, that is three co-ordinate perſonal gods in one being. The ſcripture doctrine of the chriſtian trinity reſts upon, and even reſults from the monatheiſm and monarchy of the *Father*, as ſhall be ſhewn in its place.

2. God's dominion and reign is univerſal.

As creator of all, he is proprietor of all, and hath a right to poſſeſs, diſpoſe of, command, uſe, and employ all creatures; he is therefore *Lord of hoſts*.

This great title, which anſwers to Pantocrator, tranſlated Almighty, is ſometimes taken in a *military* ſenſe; and the world of creatures are unto God as ſeveral *hoſts* and *armies*, which at his command fight the battles of this great militarypotentate againſt his enemies, and in defence of his people. The tribes of Iſrael were his hoſts, Exod. vi. 26. and he was unto them a militaiy King, the Lord general of their armies who fought their battles, and whom they celebrate as a *man of war*, (military hero) the Lord of hoſts, the Lord mighty in battles, the King of glory. I. Sam. xvii. 45. Pſ. xxiv. 7. 8. But ſometimes hoſts only ſignify an orderly multitude of creatures. Gen. xi. 4. Iſa. vi. 3. Rev. iv. 8.

God's univerſal dominion is originally underived, independent in its exerciſe, moſt perfect in its manner, all-controling and irreſiſtible in its operation, and in duration interminable.

3. The reign of God over all includes the exerciſe of an univerſal governing providence, ſuperintending and diſpoſing of all things like a *rightful* King.

Will and pleaſure, without counſel or wiſdom to direct, juſtice and goodneſs to accompany, are not the rule of God's dominion and ſovereignty. His government is placid, legal, perfectly wiſe, juſt and good, of a parental nature, conſerving what he hath produced, of great manſuetude and patience, treating beings according to what they are, and uſing them for what they are fitted. His adminiſtration is for the moſt part an unwearied exerciſe of *loving kindneſs, judgment* and *righteouſneſs in the earth*, Jerem. ix. 24. a vigilancy for his creatures' welfare. As he made none to be miſerable, he decrees the miſery of none without reſpect had to their characters; none are ſinners or ſinful by his efficiency, or influence, but they become ſinners by their abuſe of liberty. He is a Friend to virtue in his reign, the Patron of oppreſſed innocence, the the Diſtributor of juſtice, and the Exerciſer of benevolence. It is therefore matter of rejoicing that the Lord reigneth. Pſ. xcvii. 1.

4. He reigneth as King over all, with irreſiſtible authoritative power.

Thus he ruleth ſome conſtantly, and all occaſionally. He even cauſes the unruly wills and paſſions of men, to ſubſerve the purpoſes of his government. The fates of kingdoms and individuals depend upon him. By him the devil and his agents are enchained, the devices of politicians fruſtrated, and the counſels of princes infatuated, without his being chargeable with the faults of free agents, or the deſtruction of their moral agency.

5. God is in a ſenſe a kingdom eſtate to the divided univerſe of rationals, by a government proper to them.

As rationals are capable of moral government, and accountable, neither the good nor bad are their own *maſters*, but are ſubject to a Superior, whoſe right it is to rule them, and they ought all in fact to be his liege ſubjects, and to live his life.

Of right and in fact he is the Law-giver and Judge of all, and they all have some notices of his universal law, so that their conduct is inexcusable if they do not glorify him as God; and he will bring them into judgment.

This universal moral government over men is adapted to their individual and social capacity. Being the Author of man's social principles, he is the Founder of human societies, the greater and lesser, which only exist here in this world, and so as to be rewarded or punished in their social connections. His religion as to them is of *this world*. They exist by his ordinance, and the government of them is of a mixed kind, *civil religious*, and the law of God by which they are governed is of *civil religious* interpretation. Right behavior in these relations will be productive of happiness here where they only exist in them. The jurisdiction of superiors over inferiors is under God, and extends only to overt acts of well or ill doing. The civil religious rule of fathers, husbands and magistrates, in moral respects, is the same in all nations, where the gospel hath come, and where it hath not come, and would be the same if there was no future life. The natural and civil superiors should imitate God and Christ in the exercise of their superiority, serving God in such relations from the principles which they are possessed of.

It is shameful to see a ruler who is in state a god, or a husband, and father, who are in state lords, like to the evil one in their morals and administration, and especially if they are by profession christians.

*But here the forementioned distinction must be particularly illustrated, viz. That God is not King of all as he is of some, of men and nations as he is of saints.*

*The obligation of men, families, nations, and even devils, to obey God is indisputable; yet saints only are his liege subjects, the rest in fact are aliens, not of his kingdom, but in the world as a polity of which the devil is the god.*

In every regular polity there is a mutual obligation between the ruler and ſubjects, even though no formal contract is made, and they are alſo of the *ſame kind*, like head and members of one body. A human political head hath a human political body, and a divine political head muſt have a body politic of the ſame kind with himſelf. God is no intrinſic head in the uſual ſenſe of politics to all rationals, nor are they his domeſtics, citizens and ſubjects. There is no *worldly* kingdom of God, of which he is the divine head: God's kingdom is of heaven, and the devil is prince and god of this world. The church, eccleſia, hath its name from kalo, to call forth out of the world, and its members are citizens of heaven.

When the kingdom eſtate of human polities is conſidered, it is found the rulers are *in* and *of* them as the governing head. The father of a family is the intrinſic head of that only, let his extra-domeſtic power be what it will. A king is of the ſame ſpecies with his liege ſubjects. In like manner the godhead is the reigning eſtate of ſaints only, and they form one politic ſyſtem, the houſehold of God, of him the family in heaven and earth is named: Eph. ii. 19. and iii. 5. Heb. xii. 22. Eph. ii. 1, 2. Rev. xv. 3. I. Cor. xi. 3. One city of the living God: one holy popular commonwealth of New Iſrael, of which the old was a type: a community of ſaints, of which God is the chief ſaint, the holy One. If God was the reigning eſtate of all, they muſt be of *his kind*, or he of *theirs*; but this is not *fact* at preſent, however it was originally, or will be finally.

The kingdom eſtate of Old Iſrael will illuſtrate and confirm the above idea. God was King only of native or factive Jews, Amos iii. 2. and yet he was then monarch of the univerſe, an extra-ſocietive head of other nations. "There is no God in all the earth but in Iſrael," I. Chron. xiii. 11. as there is no Chriſt but in his church.

And the contrary hypothesis is full of atheism and absurdity. For if God is now the reigning estate, as King and God, of all rationals, then devils are of the same polity or city he is, and the kingdom of heaven includes hell: God is the Deity of this world which doth not own or know him, or is acknowledged by him. It makes God to be unholy, or all to be holy, for all must be *alike, to be of one,* and have any *concord.* It would be equally proper to place the devil at the head of a holy empire, to consider Christ as King of an antichristian kingdom, and the pope a religious head of protestants. To suppose Jehovah, Jove, and Lord, (Baal) saint and savage, the same, confounds every thing; light and darkness, heaven and hell, good and bad beings. "Heathen gods should not be named where our Jehovah's known." The contrary hereunto is the religious theory of pagans, and of some christians. But if pagan gods and heathen men form one *whole* in conjunction with the true God and saints; if the heathen Jove is Jehovah, and Baal the same; so is Bel and the dragon, Beelzebub and Dagon, and many more for rhyme's sake might come into the groupe. This excludes God's church, or the world is his church, wicked men and devils the members of it: heathen need not change their quarters, salvation may be obtained in hell as well as in heaven, or more properly there is no such place as the former, nor even the latter as distinguished from it.

The present state of the natural and moral universe, and especially of the now natural state of man as an alien from the life and kingdom of God, confirm the above distinction. The whole constitution of both natural and moral things in this world, and the *order* in which they existed at, and from the beginning of it, shew that God's creation is in a divided and deranged posture. Darkness and light are contending with each other, and darkness was first, for the light shone out of it in our system. One being is opposed to another, and even one

part of the ſame being to another part. This cannot be the firſt ſtate of things as originating from the fountain of light, and the God of order. God did not by phyſical efficiency create devils, or men aliens and rebels. Man's firſt eſtate did not need a new creation, or new birth. And though all are now *natively* aliens, we now ſee ſome factively made nigh, ſome viſibly and others typically, and ſome really. The ſtate of the preſent Jews is mixed, pagan-judaical; ſome are pagan-mahometan, and that of papiſts pagan-chriſtian. But ſome dwell in God, and do their works in him. Since this latter ſtate is not native, but factive, God is not the Head of all as he is of ſome.

But what puts this matter beyond all reaſonable doubt, is the ſcripture account of the polity of evil angels. Their being and polity is no fiction, though heathen denied it in the ſcripture notion, and ſome pretended believers in revelation diſpute it. Celſus charges chriſtians with an impious error, in making a certain adverſary to God whom they call the devil. And Arnobius ſaith, "The devils were to a great degree unknown before Chriſt who detected them." The knowledge of Satan and his kingdom is nigh half of chriſtianity, and yet what ſyſtems of divinity teach it? The philoſophic pagans held the univerſe to be one kingdom in the ſenſe of a polity, united by a kind of univerſal benevolence. But ſuch benevolence cannot be *holy*, becauſe it includes love to them, with whom the truly holy are obliged to be at *virtuous enmity* at preſent. The ancient religions of Perſians, Egyptians, Bramins, Chineſe, Tyrians, &c. all held to the exiſtence of an evil being, the author of evil, and that he had many adherents. The manichean hereſy of two ſupreme principles, the one of good, the other of evil, is only a corruption of the ſcripture account of this matter. The very exiſtence of moral evil ſuppoſes an evil one, for the ſupreme Author of good cannot be the efficient cauſe of that evil. A ſinner or tranſgreſſor is ſo made by himſelf, through an abuſe of liberty, and his voluntary conſent.

Another illuſtration of the above important truth may be taken from the ſpecific nature and comprehenſion of that religion and condition God is of. His religion is ſanctity, and his religioniſts are true theiſts, and the comprehenſion of the peculiarities thereof is theiſm of religion and condition. God's religioniſts are of his life and mind, they conſort and ſymbolize with him in ſentiment and practice. The primitive chriſtians called themſelves the *diſciples* and *ſect* of God. All of this religion are in ſociety, and alliance with God; others are *atheoi, atheiſts, without God.* And certainly he is not the King and God of ſuch.

To conclude the idea of God, as he is to be conſidered both as to his ſtate and as to his nature: ſome of his perfections are vital and perſonal, others are imperial. His life is eternal in holineſs and love; "His underſtanding is infinite." *He is a God of knowledge*, I. Sam. ii. 3. original, expreſſing the extent, variety and perfection of the divine knowledge. He is *perfect* in every vital, perſonal, and imperial excellency. Exiſting as God before any creature was made, he was as happy then as he is ſince: His vital and perſonal perfection was the ſame it is ſince creation. Juſtice, goodneſs, holineſs, wiſdom, power, and grace, conſtituted his character before they were exerciſed in his works, and therefore the exerciſe of them added nothing to the all-ſufficient, and ſelf-ſufficient God, Lord and King.

*From the above idea of God, his rights and dues are inferred. All piety and godlineſs is comprifed* in rendering to God the things that are God's. Matt. xxii. 21. *True godlineſs as a correſpondence to this idea, includes ſuch honor and ſervice, as is proper to his degree, rank, ſtate, dignity and condition—and to his nature and perſonal character.*

The full declaration of the rights of God belongs to the practical part of the ſcience of ſanctity; and therefore they will be but briefly mentioned in this theory.

*Firſt*, of the honor and ſervice ſuited to the degree, rank, ſtate, dignity and condition of the divine Majeſty.

That this glorious Perſonage hath *rights*, and ought to be treated by other beings according to what he is in himſelf, and to them, all muſt allow, and that every being, according to his ability, ought to glorify him as God. As to moral agents they are his creatures, and therefore of *right* and by *obligation*, his ſubjects and ſervants. An atheiſt ſpeculative, if ſuch there be, and practical, is a moſt odious being, as an inverter of the order of things, and can never be a good man or citizen. If God hath no rights, man can claim none as his own. Nations have been ſenſible of this, and have had their god, or gods, and religion, and owned that ſome allegiance, homage, revenue, and tribute, was the unalienable due of him whom they called god.

The honor due to God muſt be proper to his rank and dignity, for any other is unworthy of him, and a treating him with manifeſt injuſtice. His degree being tranſcendent to creatures, his rights and dues muſt be divine or creature-tranſcendent. And as he alone is God, he alone merits that honor which is the magnificent, creature-tranſcendent honor, worſhip and ſervice of the Moſt High.

1. Which compriſeth in it whatever is doing him real honor and ſervice, to the excluſion of whatſoever is otherwiſe.

The ſcripture expreſſeth all duty to ſuperiors by the word *honor*. Nothing muſt be neglected that is really honoring him, whether internal or external, by doing or ſuffering, abſtinence or performance. This therefore includes a knowledge of him, belief in him, acknowledging him as God, and our God, confeſſing his name, profeſſing his religion, obſerving his inſtitutes, obeying his laws, keeping his day, reverencing his ſanctuary, offering him the ſacrifices of prayer and praiſe in private, in the family and in public, and performing the duties we owe to

ourſelves or others from a regard to him, and alſo treating things and perſons according to their relation to him.

2. His ſtate and rank demands the *utmoſt* and *total* of our honor and ſervice.

The whole ſpirit, ſoul and body, all that men have, or are, is of right his: the whole of their *eſtimation*, the total of their affection and intenſe love, *erchomcha* from the bowels, &c. Pſ. xviii. 1. original.

3. His dignity demands the *ſupreme* and *ſovereign* honor and ſervice of the ſoul. Our prime, chief, predominant, peerleſs, incomparable and only great love is his due, let it coſt what it will, &c.

4. Such honor as is incommunicable to another without the crime of idolatry.

Idolatry is either *devotional* or *ſpiritual*. The former hath three branches, idolatry in *opinion*, in *affection*, and *honorary practice*. Spiritual idolatry conſtitutes an *evil life*, as the other doth an evil religion. Covetouſneſs is idolatry; ſome make a god of their belly.

*Secondly*. Godlineſs, as ſuited to the *nature* and perſonal character of God, muſt be divinely holy, as his *life* is. Sanctity is his life.

1. The piety muſt be *true* in the *real* and *perſonal* acceptation to anſwer to the nature of God.

Truth of piety in the *real* acceptation is according to the inſtitution of the true religion, of which the true God is the Deity; for there can be but one true religion, as there is but one God; the life it requires is after God and according to him. Some pagans were true worſhippers of falſe gods, their religion itſelf was ungodlineſs.

Truth of piety *perſonal*, is when the religioniſt of the true God, is ſincere and faithful. This is oppoſed to hypocriſy, as the other was to ſuperſtition.

2. Piety, as ſuited to the nature of God, muſt be according to the religion of *ſoul* intereſts, as diſtinguiſhed from bodily.

The *kind* of religion God is the inſtitutor of as *King of nations*, concerns the *bodily*, and *this world's intereſt* of men. But the religion of God as *King of ſaints*, relates to the *ſoul*, and the *next world's* intereſts of men. This important diſtinction appears from a ſurvey of the law of Moſes, and the ſame will apply to the law of nature and nations. The Jews were men having the law written in their hearts like others; they had alſo many revealed notices of the divine will in poſitive inſtitutions, prophecies and promiſes of Chriſt to come, which were peculiar to themſelves. To theſe the *law was added*, Gal. iii. 19. I. Tim. i. 9. Heb. ix. 1. to anſwer *bodily*, *worldly*, and *national* purpoſes, as appears from its *worldly ſanctuary and temporal rewards and puniſhments*. It conſidered them as citizens of *this world* in the relations of parents and children, huſbands and wives, rulers and ſubjects, *where* only they exiſt in theſe connections, and can be rewarded or puniſhed for their well or ill doing in them. The Moſaic law in the letter of it was *civil religious*, and of like interpretation, and required ſuch obedience as originates from a *birth of the will of man*." John i. 13. In this ſenſe the young man kept it, and St. Paul *lived in all good conſcience before God*, and Amaziah *did what was right even in the ſight of the Lord*; but not with a *perfect*, that is, a renewed *heart*. This is *our own righteouſneſs which is of the law*: the righteouſneſs which exalteth a nation when rulers and ſubjects practiſe it. This is what the civil miniſters of God ought to enjoin, their authority is the ſame ſince Chriſt's coming as before and is the ſame in all nations. The four *firſt* commands declare God's rights, the fifth the rights of ſuperiors and inferiors, and the equal rights of all men are ſtated in the other five. They were a civil religious commonwealth under the King of nations, as every ſtate ought to be. A ſtate without an

eſtabliſhed religion, and none ought to be eſtabliſhed by law, but what is *of this world*, is a *headleſs monſter*. This is a piety correſpondent to the ſtate of God as King of nations; but that piety which is ſuited to his nature muſt be ſpiritual and holy, by *walking not after the fleſh but after the ſpirit*, whereby the righteouſneſs that is in the law is fulfilled in them in the true intention of it, as of ſpiritual religious interpretation. Rom. viii. 4.

3. The piety ſuited to the divine nature muſt be *vital* as well as holy.

The living God muſt have *living* ſacrifices, &c.

4. And ſuch honor as the unrenewed are not capable of, &c.

5. The piety correſpondent to the divine nature, includes *ſpiritual religious worſhip*. I. John iv. 24.

*God is ſpirit*, not *a* ſpirit, anſwering to *ſpirit* born of ſpirit. A ſpirit may exiſt without ſanctity. Neither immateriality nor incorporiety belong to the *ſpecific* character of God, or diſtinguiſh him from other ſpirits only in *degree*. *God is ſpirit* denotes his *vital ſanctity*, or *ſpiritality*, if the word may be uſed; and the worſhip muſt be like its object *in ſpirit* as oppoſed to carnality, though the body be joined, and in *truth* that is truly, ſincerely, and unfeignedly. As chriſtians we are to *worſhip God in ſpirit, and rejoice in Chriſt Jeſus*.

## CHAP. II.

### OF THE ORIGINAL CREATION AND KINGDOM OF GOD.

*An idea of the original creation and kingdom of God, conſidered materially, locally, and politically. The conſtitution, law and ſubjects of that polity: conjectures when it was created: the Moſaic creation not the* firſt, *nor out of nothing: neither was it ſpiritual nor heavenly, but natural, terreſtrial and animal only: the original and preſent, natural and legal ſtate of the whole of man.*

The Divine Majeſty is a creator, and hath a kingdom founded by creation. No thing or being but he is neceſſarily exiſtent and uncreated, and none could create itſelf. Creation hath been uſually conſidered as the production of the total being of ſomething out of nothing by an almighty exterior efficiency. This may agree to the firſt matter or ſubſtance of all beings and things. Eternal matter or eternal creation are inconceivable by us, and ſo alſo is the way and manner of the origination of the firſt matter of all things by the almighty agency of God. Neither in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, nor any other tongue that we know of, hath the word *create* any ſuch appropriate ſenſe, as to expreſs by its notation, or uſe, the production of ſomething out of nothing, but is uſed ſynonimouſly with other words which ſignify only a *change* of the *nature*, *form*, or *ſtate* of a thing or being, in which caſe ſomething is *made*, *formed*, or *builded*, that did not before exiſt only in its pre-exiſtent ſubſtance. *Thus every houſe is builded by ſome man: but he that built all things is God*: Heb. iii. 4. And *the worlds were framed by the word of God, ſo that things which are ſeen were not made out of things which do appear*: Heb. xi. 3. but out of pre-exiſtent

materials in another form. The product in creation is a *total new thing*, as a house for instance, though the builder did not create the substance of it out of nothing.

All things and beings were not created at once, but in a certain order and succession, things material first, then rational and political. But what is of particular note is that all things of the same kind, and all species of beings that do not propagate their kind were made at the same time, for it is irrational to suppose a *successive creation* of the *same kind* of things and beings, for then creation might be endless, and never finished, and by some be thought never to have began.

*The created universe consists of the following parts: the starry and planetary corporeal universe: the heaven of beatitude locally considered: a universe of rational beings to inhabit the same: the kingdom of God politically: our terrestrial system and inhabitants: and the* new creation *of God: the last will be treated of in another place, but the rest now in their order.*

1. *Of the starry and planetary corporeal universe.*

As a fact it is admitted that the *substance* of all things was produced out of nothing in a way and manner to us unknown, and inconceivable; and then the starry and planetary corporeal universe was commanded into existence in its present order. How vast these regions are, and with what beings inhabited, all are left to their own conjectures. It is supposable they are all inhabited by creatures with constitutions adapted to their climates, or are made to benefit the inhabited parts; for the Almighty made nothing in vain. The Hebrews having no one word to express the universe by, do it by mentioning the extremities, *heaven* and *earth*, which the Greeks call *Kosmos*, Acts xvii. 24. the *world*, from the beauty and order of its parts. The upper extremity of the universe hath three degrees, first, second, and third heavens. All material and immaterial things and beings, whether visible or invisible, belong to the

firſt or original creation, excepting our terreſtrial ſyſtem with its aerial heaven—And the new creation of God. The parts of this creation iſſued from God under different characters—The firſt ſubſtance and phyſical being of things iſſued from God as the firſt *cauſe* and *fountain of exiſtence*—Spirits proceeded from the Father of ſpirits—The holy being of rationals from *Paternal ſanctity*—And their politic ſocietive ſtate from the *King of ſaints*.

Creation effected the phyſical being of all things, and added ſanctity to ſuch parts as are capable of this divine impreſs. The firſt aerial heaven belongs to our ſyſtem. The ſecond heaven, which is the ſeat of the fixed ſtars, may be thought inferior to the third, where is the throne of God. In creating the planetary and ſtarry corporeal univerſe, the laws of their motions were fixed, and their powers eſtabliſhed. Here a vaſt field is opened to pious, truly philoſophic minds, ſerving greatly to enlarge our ideas of the greatneſs, and manifold works of God, and of the infinite majeſty of their Almighty Creator.

2. *Of the heaven of beatitude, locally underſtood, we are knowing but in part.*

Its ſite is in the etherial regions, and ſome chriſtian philoſophers of no mean fame, have thought it to be right over the *milky way*, which cauſes that bright viſible effulgence, not otherwiſe ſatisfactorily to be accounted for. Of what materials this was built, and in what form, may be learned from St. John's deſcription of the new heaven. It may be well thought to be moſt pure and glorious, as deſigned for the reſidence of the divine King and his holy ſubjects; in which was every thing delightful, and happifying to them, conſidered as their *own habitation*.

3. *When God had built his material houſe and furniſhed it, he produced rationals to inhabit it.*

Of rationals we know but two orders, viz. angels, or

cherubims, as the Hebrews call them, and what we call human ſouls, or ſpirits, which they call iſchim.

All ſpirits are alike, phyſically conſidered, with only a gradual difference between them. But each ſpecies is diſtinguiſhed by their vital nature in which theſe intellectuals exiſt. God as a ſpirit exiſts in the divine nature, which is vital ſanctity, the life and vital ſubſtance of his infinite intellect, and is itſelf infinite. Angels exiſt in the angelical, ſouls or human ſpirits exiſt in the human nature, which is a vital ſubſtance and vehicle to each, or a ſpiritual body incorruptible and immortal, and at pleaſure inviſible to mortals. Since the ſpirits of men equally iſſued with angels from the Father of ſpirits, and are the offspring and children of God, and ſince they do not propagate their ſpecies by a ſexual difference, or intercourſe, and we ſhall be like or equal to angels in the reſurrection, it is moſt rational to ſuppoſe that this was our original condition, and that all ſpirits were produced at once, had the ſame habitation, and were equally endowed with rationality, freedom, and immortality, with ſanctity, and a fitneſs for ſociety with God, and with one another. It is allowed that ſanctity or holineſs belongs not to a creature as ſuch, yet without it no rational is fit for *ſociety* with God. And as Chriſt creates none without *renewing* them in *knowledge, righteouſneſs and true holineſs after the image of him that created them;* and to *renew* is to reſtore what was: ſo God created none at firſt without *original righteouſneſs*, or as aliens from his life, unfit for communion with him, or as rebellious to his government. The above reaſons will not be invalidated by ſuppoſing the reſtoration to be *with ſome advantage*, becauſe what never was cannot be *renewed, or reſtored, and after the image of him that created him*, if he had not been originally created in that image. That the *own habitation and firſt eſtate* of the angels who ſinned were heavenly, cannot be doubted, Comp. Job iv. 18, with xv. 15, if we conſider what the ſcripture

faith, and that heaven and hell divide the univerſe, and that there was no hell in the original creation of God, there being then no ſinners, and conſequently no priſon needed for their confinement and puniſhment. Certainly ſouls are of heavenly cognation and alliance, of heavenly origin and deſcent; heaven is their home, their father's houſe from whence they have gone out, and their renovation and reſtoration is their *return*. By that original righteouſneſs or ſanctity with which all rationals were endued in their firſt creation, is intended the *principle* and *root of holy exerciſes*, agreeably to the maxim of our Savior, "*Make the tree good and the fruit will be good.*" Without the *divine nature*, there can be no holy acts, any more than there can be human acts without the human nature. Humanity doth not conſiſt in human acts, nor *holineſs* in *holy exerciſes*, any more than the goodneſs of the tree conſiſts in the goodneſs of its fruit.

4. *The original creation founded the original kingdom of God.*

As God formed holy rationals, for ſociety with himſelf, there muſt have been ſuch a polity conſtituted as we call a kingdom, and the relation of King and ſubjects, with a declaration of rights and dues, determining who ſhall be ſovereign, and who ſhall be ſubject, and enacting the law of adminiſtration, the meaſures of obedience, and the reward of the ſame, and the puniſhment in caſe of failure.

The creation of a kingdom is political as well as real, and without ſuch a conſtitution, ſettlement, eſtabliſhment, or covenant, there could be no King, nor ſubjects, government, law nor juſtice, no kingdom nor city. The original kingdom of heaven was thus founded by God as mere creator, the ſole ſupreme King, without any *triune* adminiſtration or ſubordinate rule. All rationals were the ſubjects, all were holy, and all happy. This kingdom of God is termed *original*, to diſtinguiſh it from the *new mediatorial* kingdom of God, Chriſt, and heaven, which

now is, which is founded by God as Redeemer or New Creator.

In *that* God was *all in all* in the government; all were native saints, citizens who had *domicilium in urbe*, mansions in the heavenly city, and were domestics of God's house. Then there was no sin nor sinner, no devil nor apostate, no rebels, no mediator nor redeemer. But the present kingdom of heaven is made by a reconciliation of things in earth and heaven, and recapitulation of them in Christ. Eph. i. 10. Colos. i. 20. The present design is to *recover* and *restore* all things into the kingdom of God all in all where they once were.

*The constitution or covenant of life of that kingdom, subsisting between God and holy rationals, upon condition of perfect obedience, was God's holy spiritual moral law, ordained to continue life to the unlapsed, while obeyed, as every proper law is.* It required unsinning obedience, declared the rights and dues of God, and his subjects according to legal justice: obedience without any criminal defect rendered the reward of debt; and the transgression of it rendered the punishment equally of debt also, without any possibility of recovery upon the foot of law, or while the law was in force and trespasses were imputed according to law. All were capable of obeying by the strength of holy nature; for such as fell might have stood as well as the holy angels: but being free agents, without which they could not be moral accountable agents, and *unconfirmed*, they might abuse their liberty and fall, as some in fact did. But being lapsed it was impossible for them to be restored only by the super-legal grace of the sovereign. Grace is not of the law. It is in consequence, and by occasion of the lapse of some from original sanctity, that the Mosaic creation took place as introductory to the mediatorial economy. The moral, is a royal law, and must sometime or other have been an institution to eternal life. But in this world there never was any other way to eternal life, than by the gift of God through Jesus Christ as

to come, or as come. And therefore this is not the firſt world in which rationals have exiſted, for God certainly never created ſouls loſt, and as needing redemption from his hands, and a law to give them life.

5. Conjectures about the time of the original creation can only be of weight according to their probability.

The learned Pearſon on the creed ſuppoſes it not to be impoſſible *for ſomething to be coeval with God, as the heavens his throne*, or *for the creature to be created from all eternity by a free determination of his will.* Another poſition of his is not more admiſſible, "*That no inſtant of time can be aſſigned wherein God could not have made the world.*" Cauſes muſt precede their effects, and an eternal cauſe of an eternal effect cannot therefore poſſibly be. For if the world is not ſelf-exiſtent, but hath its being from another, that other muſt exiſt before it, becauſe it is impoſſible that what depends upon another, and had its being from it, ſhould be co-exiſtent with it. God as creator muſt be before the creature, and what was made had a beginning, and therefore cannot be co-eternal with him. When the firſt created things and beings began to be we are ignorant. But that all things and creatures did not begin to exiſt at one and the ſame time, there is more than conjectural evidence. There muſt have been ſome natural order, the material creation muſt have preceded that of vital beings deſigned to inhabit it, otherwiſe they could have had no place to exiſt in. Creatures of the ſame ſpecies and cognation muſt have been created together, and all that are immortal, for traduction is to ſupply the waſte of mortality. Farther, all the parts of the original creation had an exiſtence antecedent to that creation of which the Moſaic hiſtory gives an account, as appears from that hiſtory itſelf, and is ſuppoſed by the whole tenor of chriſtianity, which deſignedly leads our thoughts back to what took place long before the generation of our heaven, and earth, not ſix thouſand years ago,

It certainly doth more hurt to the credit of ſcripture to ſay, "That God created all things out of nothing in the ſpace of ſix days, and all very good," when in the Bible we find no ſuch thing, or any thing like it, but rather the contrary; than to ſay that the ſcripture doth not treat of the firſt creation, but ſuppoſes it, and begins its account with the origin of terreſtrial animal things only: becauſe this we find to be the truth of fact. A certain writer ſaith, "After heaven was created, and the angels, and the continued rebellion of ſome, and their detruſion from heaven into Tartarus, it pleaſed God to form this earth, which had remained deſolate all the time the republic of angels ſtood, which he made the place of confinement of the rebellious angels who inhabit the darkneſs of this world. And that a great ſpace of time intervened from the firſt creation to this, the following words ſhew: *The earth was without form and void, and darkneſs was upon the face of the deep*: which words the divine penman would not have added, if the adornation of it, had preſently followed its production out of nothing." St. Chryſoſt, Hilary, Caſſian, and the generality of the Jews, &c. ſuppoſe an intelligible world of ſpirits exiſted long before our terraqueous globe and what belongs to it were created. Epiſcopius and Deſcartes diſpute for this opinion, that this earth lay long in a chaotic ſtate before it was thus adorned. And this will farther appear when we come to conſider the Moſaic creation itſelf. For if what we have conſidered as parts of the original creation were not made before the Moſaic creation took place, they never were made, or Moſes was a very faulty hiſtorian, for it will be found he gives no manner of account of them, or of any thing only as relating to our ſyſtem.

Before the account of the original creation of God is finiſhed, the *cauſe* or *efficient* thereof muſt be mentioned; and the *motive* inducing thereunto muſt be juſt mentioned alſo.

The *cauſe* or *efficient* was the one perſon, God, called the Father, not excluding the agency of the eternal Spirit, as to ſome parts of it at leaſt.

The creation of all things is aſcribed to him that ſits upon the throne. Rev. iv. 10. I. Cor. viii. 6. Acts iv. 24, 27. *Of the Father are all things, the Father of the holy Child Jeſus. But ſome object to this the ſcripture uſe of the plural noun Elohim in the account of the Moſaic creation, and from hence infer that a Trinity was the Author of that creation, and of this alſo.* But if Elohim ſignifies the Trinity, as the Spirit of Elohim (the Trinity) moved upon the waters, there muſt neceſſarily be four perſons creating, Elohim the Trinity, and the Spirit of that Trinity, which is one too many for even triunitarian ſcholaſtics. God made Moſes an *Elohim to Pharaoh*, Exod. vii. 1. but not a Trinity. When the ſerpent tells the woman they ſhould be as the Elohim, it doth not mean a Trinity. Nor is that phraſe "Let *us* make man," or that, "Who will go for *us*, more to the purpoſe. See Luke ix. 50, and Mark ix. 40.

If the expreſſion had been, *Let Me* make man, it would look like aſking leave of a ſuperior. If this will not do, the Holy Spirit being preſent will account for the plural *us*. In Job, Behemoth, a plural noun, is joined to a ſingular verb, to expreſs his greatneſs. If Elohim ſignify dominion, as Grotius and Dr. Hammond ſay, Elohim may expreſs the greatneſs and manifold power of God, as Law-giver and Judge as well as Creator. If *us* prove a Trinity in unity, why may not *me* in the firſt command prove a unity in Trinity; and ſo change them, *Let me make man—Thou ſhalt have no other gods before us.* The Jews may be ſuppoſed to know their own language as well as any elſe: But none of them, either ancient or modern, inſpired or uninſpired, ever grounded the doctrine of a Trinity on ſuch idiomatical expreſſions. And in fact we trace no image of a Trinity in man, nor is he renewed after the image of *them*,

but *him*, that created him. Nor is there in God's other works any viſible impreſs of a Trinity.

*Remember thy Creators*, as the original is, may be accounted for idiomatically, or it may ſignify God's creating them twice, firſt as men, ſecondly as Jews, as he doth us as men, and as chriſtians. The holy and eternal Spirit of God was an agent in the original, and Moſaic creation. The completing of God's works, where the product is light, life, or ſanctity, is aſcribed to the Spirit. *The Spirit of God made me*, ſaith Job. And He moved upon the face of the waters in the beginning of the creation of our ſyſtem. Yet creation is not ſo his perſonal work as to conſtitute any his creatures and ſubjects. But the Son of God was no agent in the original or Moſaic creation, there is another creation to be aſcribed to him.

The *motive* inducing God to create was his *pleaſure*. Rev. iv. 11.

When nothing exiſted but God, nothing without himſelf could be the impulſive cauſe of creation. Being good himſelf, of pure benevolence, he was diſpoſed to communicate the good of exiſtence, and its attendant advantages, to things and creatures which then were not. But although there never was a time when God was not good, it will not follow that he was always communicative of his goodneſs; becauſe communicative goodneſs is not *neceſſary*, but free, and he would not have been evil, if he had never created any.

Beings void of judgment, when put in motion, act always to the extent of their power. The ſun gives light and heat by neceſſity, without any ſuſpenſion of influence at one time more than at another. But God, in creation, was under no ſuch conſtraint, nor was he determined by the hope of any greater perſonal happineſs or glory than what he then poſſeſſed. His infinite underſtanding directed his determinations, but he was free in his reſolves and acts. And as goodneſs moved him to create, he gave nothing but beneficial being to any creature,

by his creative agency. And as his free benevolent determinations were accompanied with power, "He ſpake the word, and all were created." *Let there be light, and there was light.*

*An account of the Moſaic creation muſt now be given, as not original, ſpiritual or heavenly, but natural, terreſtrial and animal; not out of nothing, but out of pre-exiſtent materials.*

The truth of the above appears evident from the hiſtory itſelf, as explained by other ſcriptures, and from the Adamical œconomy, from the origin of Chriſt and his religion, in the divine predeſtination before the world was, and its deſigned view beyond the deſtruction of all the Moſaic creation.

The writer of the hiſtory of the creation, the beginning of Geneſis gives an account of, is allowed to be Moſes the lawgiver under God to the Jews, a perſon of good abilities, verſed in all the learning of the Egyptians, and a prophet of God. He writes it *primarily* for the Jews, then a very ignorant people, having juſt emerged from ſlavery and cruel bondage; but ſecondarily for the univerſality of mankind who might read it. It is not therefore written philoſophically, but popularly, according to common apprehenſions, as a ſpectator would have done who had been privileged with a ſight of the whole proceſs. The account he gives is confeſſedly ſhort, but intelligible, and ought not to be allegorized as ſome have done, but to be underſtood literally according to the obvious meaning of words.

The firſt verſe in chapter firſt gives the contents of the whole hiſtory of creation. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." And the firſt verſe in chapter ſecond concludes his narration. "Thus the heavens and the earth were finiſhed and all the hoſt of them." Having laid down the general plan of his hiſtory, he tells us in what ſtate the heavens and earth were before creation began. In the beginning, or commencement of that epoch he ſet out from,

the whole ſubject matter of his hiſtory was *earth*, without form and void, and *waters*, for his heaven was made by fixing a firmament or expanſum in the midſt of the waters, dividing the waters under it from the waters above it, which firmament is called heaven, made the ſecond day. The matter of the earth exiſted before, but in a very confuſed ſtate, without order and regularity: and darkneſs was upon the face of the deep or abyſs. Here is alſo a plain evidence that was not the firſt creation, becauſe chaotic confuſion was prior to order, and darkneſs to light in our ſyſtem, which never can be thought to be the firſt productions of the God of order and Father of lights. The natural ſtate of things was like that moral ſtate of things that exiſted prior to the new creation, for there is a ſtrict analogy between theſe creations, conſidering the firſt as natural, and figurative of the latter: in both, the darkneſs was firſt, the light ſhined out of darkneſs, and in darkneſs, and the darkneſs comprehended it not. II. Cor. iv. 6. John i. 5. After deſcribing the ſtate of things before creation, he mentions the firſt preparatory to it, in the *Spirit of Elohim's moving*, like a fowl over her eggs or young, *upon the face of the waters*. This put the ſtagnant maſs in motion, and prepared it for the firſt creative command, "Let there be light, and there was light." Longinus hath reputed this as an example of the ſublime: and others have remarked that it is an expreſſive tautology in the original. It was natural light, the light of this world: and it was *day light*, for "God divided the light from the darkneſs, and called the light day, and the darkneſs night." And yet it was *ſunleſs* day light, for the celeſtial luminaries do not appear till the fourth day. They who think this primordial light luminous particles in the chaos ſeparating themſelves, and which on the fourth day were gathered into a body and formed the ſun, forget that there was already day and night, which cannot be in our world without the ſun, and the earth's

diurnal rotation. It muſt be light from the ſun, though that did not yet appear. The light could not originate from darkneſs, for that is unnatural; vinegar may originate from wine, but wine was never generated of vinegar. The ſuppoſing the ſun to have exiſted before as part of a prior creation, eaſily accounts for this primordial light. For the chaos was in ſuch a ſtagnant ſtate that the light could not enter till the Spirit put it in motion. All before was caliginous, condenſed, palpable darkneſs, like the air about ſulphurous mountains, from whence iſſue black and pitchy vapors, ſultry miſts, and dark clouds which obſcure the day and are impenetrable to the rays of the ſun. The parts of the chaos being put in motion, the ſun's light began to enter the firſt day, diſtinguiſhing it from night, and on the ſecond day it gained farther admiſſion. The parts of the fluid maſs became more ſeparated, the groſſer ſubſided to make the earth and ſeas, the more tenuous remained above. The ſecond day the firmament was made to divide the upper and lower waters, and is called *heaven*, all the heaven that was then created. Then an attenuation of the matter in the ſuperior region of the chaos took place, and a partition of it was made into two diſtinct regions, *aerial aqueous*, and *terraqueous*. Theſe alterations which began on the firſt day, and proceeded thus far on the ſecond day, gave admiſſion to the ſun beams, and cauſed ſuch a dim illumination as we obſerve at break of day. On the third day the waters under heaven are gathered together into one place and called the ſeas, and the dry land appeared which is called earth. Out of the earth are produced graſs, herbs, and trees: and all this time it grew lighter and lighter, when on the fourth day, all vapors being diſſipated, the ſun, moon, and other luminaries, appeared in their order, garniſhing the firmament. The ſun's creation is only a relative making of it, ſo as to become a luminary to our terraqueous globe, which it could not be while it remained in its chaotic ſtate. As a matter of

faith the ſun and other lights were really made, but he faith nothing of their then creation, and the ſun's being made central to certain ſupernal orbs which are known to exiſt, and revolve round it. All the parts of this creation are for the conveniency of our ſyſtem, the boundary of it. The Moſaic earth conſiſted only of what is ſublunary, *the earth ſtanding out of the water, and in the water, the world that periſhed by the flood, and is to be deſtroyed by fire.* II. Peter iii. 6, 7. Since the whole Moſaic world was created out of his chaotic earth, if his creation includes the whole univerſe, then all the celeſtial orbs were extracted out of this dark confuſed abyſs, the globes of fire were made out of muddy water, and a little earthy dirt no larger than a point compared to them. Such an origination is unnatural, and the generation of heavenly things from earthly is akin to the atheous hypotheſis which originates life, and mind, from dull matter. Nay, the heaven of beatitude, if *then* made, ſprang from this chaotic earth; and it was *then* made, or never, if this was the firſt creation. Where do we read of the creation of angels or human ſpirits in the firſt ſix days work? Nay, we read of their being ſpectators of it, *ſinging together and ſhouting for joy, at the laying of the foundation of this earth.* Job xxxviii. 7. On the fifth day fiſh and fowl were made out of the waters. And on the ſixth day, cattle, creeping things, and all beaſts out of the earth, and laſt of all, man out of the duſt of the ground, with the ſame breath of life with other beaſts, and no pre-eminence above them only as having dominion over them. Eccle. iii. 18, 19.

He gives no account of the creation, or even exiſtence of the heaven of happineſs, of angels good and bad, or even of the ſpirit of man. Such total ſilence in theſe reſpects is not a mere negative proof that this was not the firſt creation of God. Becauſe the buſineſs of an hiſtorian, as a good judge, Livy, ſaith, is *enarrare res geſtas*, to relate things tranſacted; and, it may

be added, according to their order and importance. If this creation was out of nothing, and extended to all beings, and things, it is impoſſible to vindicate Moſes from criminal deficiency, in omitting the weightieſt matters, and moſt important to be known, and dwelling upon what was comparatively trivial. If he undertook to give an account of the whole creation and kingdom of God, no man could do worſe unleſs he had written falſehood. He gives no account of the firſt matter's origin, and leaves all to conclude his chaos might have been eternal, writes nothing of heaven or rationals, their ſtate and condition, of the heavenly bodies, their greatneſs, numbers, ſituation, inhabitants, furniture, &c. Had they been ſubjects of his hiſtory, he muſt have deſcribed them as minutely as he doth terreſtrial animal things. For certainly the city of God, his throne, the celeſtial paradiſe, the glorious angels, and celeſtial ſpirits, their polity, law, and government, and the lapſe of Devils, were as worthy of his deſcriptive pen, as the earthly paradiſe, the animal Adam and his wife, fowls, fiſhes, beaſts and plants. But, if his creation was only of our terreſtrial ſyſtem, and of earthly animal things, and even conſiders man as then made only an animal, though their chief, he hath done well, he is intelligible and conſiſtent, as our hypotheſis renders him. It is from other ſcriptures and not from the hiſtory of the Hexemeron, that we learn the exiſtence of angels, of devils and their lapſe, and even of the ſpirit of man within him diſtinguiſhing him from beaſts.

The Moſaic account of the creation, ſtate, and œconomy of Adam, as compared with other ſcriptures, confirms the truth of the above hypotheſis. See the account in Geneſis, ſecond chapter and ſeventh verſe. Made out of the duſt of the ground, of the earth, earthy, I. Cor. xv. 47. and by the Lord's breathing into his noſtrils the breath of life, he became *a living ſoul*. The original *Niſchmath Chajiim* is applied to all living

creatures, they all have living ſouls equally with man, all *one breath*, and man hath no preeminence above them, Eccles. iii. 18, 19, 20. only as the breath of life was breathed into his noſtrils. The breath of life is the breath of reſpiration; man dies by breathing it out, or yielding up the ghoſt or ſoul. Job xxvii. 3. Gen. xi. 17. Job xii. 10. Pſ. civ. 29. cxxxv. 17. cxlvi. 4. cl. 6. Iſai. ii. 22. Jerem. x. 14. Hab. ii. 19. Acts xvii. 25. Lam. iv. 10. &c. We, as exiſting in this world, conſiſt *in ſpirit, ſoul and body:* but man ranks with beaſts in his preſent eſtate, that God might manifeſt him, he was made and placed among beaſts: and what is common to man and beaſts is no part of the human nature, that belongs to the ſpirit which goeth upward, and not to the ſoul and body. And thus Adam was made, as it is written, a living ſoul, a natural, earthy, animal man as diſt inguiſhed from a ſpiritual man, and corruptible as diſtinguiſhed from incorruption. I. Cor. xv. 45, 46, 47, and 50. Acts xvii. 28. Heb. ii. 14. *He had not the ſpirit*, for no natural man hath, or receiveth *the things of the ſpirit*. An immortal ſpirit coming from God was then made partaker of fleſh and blood, as it is now in all the ſucceſſive generations of men. But it was not then made. It now returns to God who gave it when it leaves the body, which proves its prior exiſtence, as he could not give what was not, nor could that *return* where it never was. As ſpirits, we are the offspring and children of God. Adam is expreſsly ſaid to be a *figure, type, of him that was to come*, Rom. v. 14. even Chriſt a ſpiritual man. A figure or type of a ſpiritual man is not ſpiritual, any more than ſhadow is ſubſtance, or nature is grace. This determines Adam's character as head of his deſcendants in nature only, and things natural. Being a natural man, he was innocent, but not holy: he was alſo upright, but human uprightneſs is a ſtate between ſin and holineſs, but is not the latter, any more than the human nature is the

divine. *The image of God, man* was created in, conſiſts not in immateriality or intellectuality, for then the devils would be in his image as ſpirits. It was not God's holy image, it belonged to God's *ſtate*, not to his nature; and whatever it is, man never loſt it, but retains it now. Gen. i. 26. ix. 6. I. Cor. xi. 7. James iii. 9. It is his dominion over creatures: *Man is the image and glory of God as the head of the woman.* Noah had his dominion over beaſts extended to their lives which Adam had not. In Adam we ſee only a natural man, terreſtrial and animal. His body was corruptible and mortal, elſe it would not have been placed where it was. What divines have written of his *wondrous knowledge*, his ſkill in philoſophy, and his amazing ſagacity in naming the creatures, amounts to nothing when we read the hiſtory of him. His naming of the creatures from their obvious qualities and not their internal natures, was like a farmer's naming his ſtock. He had every thing to learn, as either naturally or ſupernaturally taught of God, eſpecially ſpeech and language: and was wholly deſtitute of experience. Being alone, and as the principles of both ſexes in him were undivided, and God having formed the earth to be repleniſhed with human animals for immortal ſpirits to be united to, for their manifeſtation and vindication into the liberty of the ſons of God by Chriſt foreordained before that creation, out of Adam ſleeping God took *a rib* and *builded a woman*, and by marriage *made her a wife*. There is no more account of the creation of the woman's ſpirit than there was of the man's. Traductioniſts may ſay where it came from. Moſes obſerves they were both *naked* without ſhame, which argues innocence: children now being naked feel no ſhame till they know good and evil.

The œconomy or diſpenſation Adam was under, every way correſponds to his before deſcribed nature, ſtate and character. We read not a word of any covenant of life ſubſiſting between

God and him upon condition of perfect obedience, made not only for himself, but posterity. Not a word of any promise of eternal life. Innumerable airy castles have been built upon the baseless foundation of representative, hereditary, or traductional holiness, immortality and happiness in case he had stood, and of the like sin, mortality and misery by his lapse. Sometimes a promissory settlement is called a covenant, but it is a covenant of one party only. Such an one God established with Noah and every living thing, not to send another flood upon them. But the transaction with Adam did not amount even to an express *promise*. There is only a *positive prohibition* of his eating of one tree, under a certain penalty, and a permissive command of eating of the others, especially of the tree of life. Gen. ii. 16, 17. The command is first given, *Thou mayest eat*, and the prohibition is by way of exception. This is the famed *covenant of life*, the first *covenant of works*, consisting in doing nothing, the *Shibboleth of scholastic* orthodoxy, of which thousands of volumes have been written, taught to children in catechisms, and handed down from old father to young father with an anathema if not believed. But the account Moses gives is simply this. Adam, an innocent, natural, terrestrial animal of the human species, the only one existing, and just come into being to begin a new world, without sin and without spiritual life, and also without the experimental knowledge of good and evil, is commanded to eat of the fruit of all the trees of the garden wherein he was placed to dress it, one tree only excepted upon the penalty of death, or returning to the ground or dust from whence he came. By having an immortal spirit added to his animal part, he was under moral obligations to love his Maker, and his neighbor when he should have any: yet he is left to the direction of the law of his mind as to these matters, and for his trial forbid to depart from innocence by eating of a particular tree. The nature of the

prohibition ſhews what his ſtate was, as it tries his obedience by reſtraining his natural appetite. That he was in his own nature mortal is moſt evident, for as fleſh and blood he could not but be liable to die in the natural courſe of things. This courſe of nature was under a particular reſtraint, or ſuſpenſion during his trial, ſo that while he was innocent he was not to die. But upon his departure from innocence, that reſtraint was to be removed, and death was to come on him penally, as it would have done naturally, had there been no ſuſpenſion. Nothing is promiſed him poſitively. What he needed was the divine nature or ſpiritual life, as the placing before him the tree of life, a type of Chriſt foreordained to come, ſhews. He was partly in the ſituation Solomon placed Shimei, who was not to die for his treatment of David, and who was under the ſame obligations to loyalty that others were, and liable to die naturally, but the day he departed out of Jeruſalem he was to die *penally* for that act, his deſert of death for his former conduct was ſuſpended by David's promiſe, and he was put upon a new trial.

The lapſe of Adam confirms our idea of his nature and ſtate. The lapſe is introduced with an account of the ſerpent repreſented as the tempter.

Now it was really the Devil who was the ſeducer: our Savior ſaith he was a murderer from the beginning, and ſo was lapſed into this world, from his original ſtanding in the kingdom of God. All accounts of the devil's lapſe, ſhort of a total apoſtacy, are unſatisfactory. It is ſaid they *ſinned*, kept not their *firſt eſtate*, but *left their own habitation*. They became tranſgreſſors of God's holy royal law, and rebels. Our Savior ſaith, "He abode not in the truth." If pride or envy, which are mere perſonal qualities, had been the devil's ſin, he would have ſinned alone, or with a few ſelect companions: from the numbers concerned, it appears to have been *ambition* in their

chief, who by his ſubtilty gradually drew others into the revolt from the divine government. He ſought to be like the Moſt High, not in his *nature*, but in his *ſtate* and *ſovereignty*. That Satan aimed at a ſovereignty and divine ſovereignty, his titles, the prince and god of this world, ſhew. He ſaw this world lie vacant in its chaotic ſtate, where he hoped to erect his diabolic empire, and render it a tolerable habitation for him and his confederates. His ſin involved in it a criminal appetite of unſubject dominion and unbounded liberty out of God's kingdom. This is the aim of the heads of revolts from government. It is abſurd to ſuppoſe that he expected to abide in heaven, nor did he deſire it, but left it and drew after him many others. It is alſo abſurd to ſuppoſe battles fought in heaven, or that Satan was hardly conquered, and driven out by Meſſiah. He knew the Almighty too well to hope to maintain his domination in heaven. There was no Meſſiah only in fore-ordination, which precludes actual being, to be chief general of the eternal King. Seeing this part of the univerſe unoccupied, he caſt an ambitious eye on it, with deſign to erect a kingdom and godſhip here, independent of the moſt High, and ſo left his own habitation to lord it here at large. Diſaffection to the government of heaven, and impatience of ſubordination, with an unbridled deſire to be chief himſelf, put him upon this project. Like Cæſar he could not bear a ſuperior, but had rather be firſt in a ſmaller, than ſecond in a greater kingdom, and this he expected to effect in this world, and ſo left *thai*, to gratify his ambitious deſigns here. What led that once holy and happy being to this audacious project was a contemplation of the ſovereign eſtate of God, which raiſed a phantom of the like in himſelf, and this being unchecked in its firſt conception, ended in his ſin and ruin. This is the more probable, as this world is Satan's kingdom of *choice*, and he is the god of it: though it is alſo his *priſon*,

and will be the place of his punishment. It is the fate of sinful projects to serve as a punishment to the projector even when his desires are gratified. He left heaven as protestants did Rome, but not for so good a cause, fugit, et fugatur, he went out and was expelled. Here we find him with his spiritual wickednesses in high places, epou raneos, aerial heavenly powers; here he was from the beginning; how long before we know not. And the placing Adam in a kind of local subjection to him, though in a paradise, was no such enviable a situation as some have imagined it to be. The accommodations are pleasant and commodious to animal nature, but excepting in its types and figures, it was as destitute of all solace to an holy spirit, as the wilds of Siberia, or the desarts of Arabia are to animal life. Where is the bread and water of life for holy souls? It was accessible to Satan as the event shews, and man made but a feeble resistance to keep him out, or his own standing.

The preceding account of the lapse of devils was introduced because Moses in his account of man's lapse attributeth his seduction to the *serpent* who deceived Eve, as what led to man's fall.

"Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made, and he said unto the woman," &c. Gen. iii. 1, 2.

It is certain the old serpent the Devil was the tempter and deceiver, for we so read in other places. The reason of his being introduced here under the name of a serpent is, that none but terrestrial animals had then been created or even mentioned; to preserve an uniformity a serpent in *name* is brought in as the tempter of man, who as then made was an animal, yet both were more than mere animals. The serpent is here considered as the symbol of Satan, as the lamb is of Christ, and the dove of the holy Ghost. As the natural world was divided into darkness and light, so was the animal, into clean and unclean beasts, and

the vegetable, into ſalutary and noxious herbs and plants, each good in their kind; but the evil were reſtrained from acting their natures to the hurt of any while man was innocent. The ſerpent was an evil beaſt then as he is now, and good in his kind; he would not be a good ſerpent without ſubtilty any more than a lamb would be good without meekneſs, or a dove without harmleſſneſs. The ſpecific natures of beaſts were the ſame then as now: Lions, tygers, wolves, ſheep, lambs, were as they are now; yet by a providential reſtraint they lay down together without hurting one another, and if no ſin had entered, the lion by a change of nature would have been brought to eat ſtraw like the ox. Iſai. xi. 6, 7. and lxv. 25. The ſcripture repreſents rationals under the name of animals whom they reſemble in ſome qualities. The ſerpent is Satan's kind of animal, as the lamb is Chriſt's. Naturaliſts ſpeak of him as an eminent ſubtiliſt. Now it was the ſerpent taken *ſpecifically* and *comprehenſively* that tempted Eve: as it was the lamb taken *ſpecifically* and *comprehenſively*, that taketh away the ſins of the world. And it is as abſurd to ſuppoſe that it was the brute ſerpent in one caſe, as it would be to ſuppoſe it was the brute lamb in the other. It was a rational diſcourſing ſerpent, for *he ſpake unto the woman*, &c. If the brute ſerpent had ſpoken or Satan in his ſhape, it would have been a prodigy, and have frighted Eve to her huſband, and defeated his project. She knew ſerpents could not ſpeak or hold diſcourſe; their organs are more unfit for it than almoſt any other creature. And it is ridiculous to imagine the ſerpent was different from what he is now, that he crawled up the tree, eat the fruit, and aſſumed a more ſhining form, and ſpake as an effect of that eating.

If ſuch a repreſentation may pleaſe children in a *Primer*, it is ſhameful for ſober Divines to put it into a *ſyſtem of truths*. Though no celeſtials or infernals were at that time made, the woman knew there were ſuch beings, for the ſerpent tells the

woman they ſhould be as the Elohim. He knew ſhe underſtood him, or elſe the motive would have been vain. It is likely theſe Elohim had frequent intercourſe with Adam and Eve, while innocent, in ſome ſhape approaching to human form, Satan in whoſe territories man was placed, though in a garden, takes advantage of this circumſtance, and takes a form familiar to the woman, *like to an angel of light*, for ſo he tempts the innocent ſucceſsfully, yet with ſome badge or mark by which he might have been known, if her eagerneſs to hear him, or deſire of the fruit, had not prevented her taking notice of it. Whether this badge of cognizance was external like that of the *cloven foot*, as the learned Mr. Mede ſuppoſes, or was to be known by what he ſuggeſted, is not for us to ſay. Though the ſuppoſition of that author is reaſonable, that none from the other world are permitted to appear here in ſuch a diſguiſe to our hurt, as that the evil cannot be diſtinguiſhed from the good. This may be laid down as a certain rule, that if any chief devil, ſub-devil or devil's imp, in any ſhape, whether of an angel of light, or miniſter of Chriſt, contradict the Almighty, as the ſerpent did, or Chriſt and his word, it is evidence enough to all true ſaints who and what they are. If the woman had minded this ſhe would have been ſafe: She was off her guard, being innocent and inexperienced, like other females ſince, and knew not that ſhe had to deal with a ſerpent full of ſubtilty, but void of harmleſſneſs. He *beguiled her*, and being *deceived* ſhe did eat. If Satan had made an organ of the brute ſerpent there would have been two tempters, whereas there was but one. If it had been written, "Now the lamb was more meek than any beaſt of the field which God had made, and he ſaid to the man or woman I will ſave mankind," would a chriſtian underſtand this, either of a brute lamb, or of Chriſt in his ſhape, or uſing it as his organ? The woman, thus beguiled and deceived, eat; but what induced the *ſaint* Adam, as ſome ſuppoſe him to be,

to comply? Mere uxoriousness. Here the ungracious confidence of strong infidel men may triumph over the weaker woman as they do often serpent like; but another *woman, a virgin*, will hereafter be introduced on the stage as the occasion of infinitely more good to men, than Eve was of evil. Sin entered our world, as St. James describes its actual commission since by every individual, only in the room of his *lust*, put natural desire or appetite, which was in itself innocent, and the fault lay in not controling it within the bounds of his Maker's command. This was Adam's original sin: and every person's actual departure from innocence, is his original sin, and introductory to all that follow. The enormity of this sin hath been greatly exaggerated, and poor Adam and Eve have been loaded with execrations by persons much worse than they, and have been thought hard of by persons much better. Make as much of it as any can, it was only against a positive prohibition under a temporal penalty, like to that inflicted on the Corinthians, death without mercy or reprieve, I. Cor. xi. 30. which would have come on him naturally in time, if the tree of life had not prevented. It was no total apostacy, or any fall from grace, but from innocence, as every person's first actual sin is. It was not like many other sins which are less thought of, as changing the object of worship, crucifying Christ, &c.

St. Augustin saith, "Job, half dead on a dung hill, resisted the temptation of his wife, while Adam in paradise complied with the sinful motion of his." And here we see the difference between the power of innocent nature, and that of grace even though in a body of sinful flesh subject to biles and sores. The malignity of this sin hath been heightened by a wrong idea of man's state, leading to wrong apprehensions of the penalty and its consequences. He hath been thought to fall from a spiritual and even celestial condition, though in an earthly paradise, to be subject to spiritual and eternal death, and to be the unfeeling

deſtroyer eternally of unborn millions. Nay, ſome have not ſcrupled to affirm, that there are infants in hell, doomed to welter under the ſcalding drops of God's wrath forever and ever, for his ſin. Such things ſurpriſe one who looks into ſcripture, and finds no image of God loſt by man at all, nor any curſe pronounced upon him, but only upon the ſerpent, and on the ground for his ſake. What was *natural* and would have taken place but for the reſtraint on the courſe of nature, becomes penal by the removal of that reſtraint: and what might have been changed for the better becomes eſtabliſhed as it now is.

The firſt conſequence of their departure from innocence is, *that their eyes were opened, and they knew that they were naked.* They were before naked and not aſhamed, becauſe innocent, but now they attempt through ſhame to hide themſelves. They act like children who know they have done miſchief. And being called to account, make an honeſt confeſſion of the matter as it was, and anſwer with the utmoſt ſimplicity. When Jehovah Elohim had traced the ſin to its author, he proceeds to pronounce ſentence upon the ſerpent, and curſeth Satan in his ſymbol. Execrations extend to all of their *kind*: and as to the brute ſerpent what was *natural* became penal. No alteration is produced in his nature, gait, or food. If the curſe had affected the ſerpent in theſe, it would have fell heavieſt upon the moſt noxious to man, whereas the reverſe is true, as theſe are the moſt erect, and eat the leaſt duſt with their food. "You are naturally a creeping, odious creature, and by creeping upon your belly expoſed to lick up duſt with your food, Iſa. lxv. 25. this ſhall be the penal eſtabliſhment of your nature for the continual inſtruction of man." But as to the old ſerpent it had a further reference, "You are the moſt deteſtable and execrable of all rationals naturally; you merit the curſe for your ſeduction of ſpirits, and for this additional

wickedneſs, ſpiritually you are a grovelling wretch, you and your generation of vipers go upon your belly, minding earthly things, feeding upon what is no better than duſt and aſhes. Be this your doom by way of penal ſettlement, be as you are, and you cannot be worſe, a ſerpent." The other part of the ſerpent's curſe is predictive, "And I will put enmity," &c. Luther and ſome others have called this the goſpel in miniature, but it was goſpel preached to the devil as part of his doom.

If Adam and Eve heard it, it was conſolatory to them: but it is never quoted in the New Teſtament, becauſe it was no promiſe to man. Literally it put enmity between the woman and the ſerpent: women have a greater antipathy to them than men, and naturaliſts ſay they have the like to women; that the ſight of each other ſhocks both; their humors are poiſonous to one another, her ſaliva to him, as his bite to her. "And between thy ſeed and her ſeed," the ſerpentine and human ſpecies. "It ſhall bruiſe thy head and thou ſhalt bruiſe his heel." Men aim at the ſerpent's head, the ſeat of life, and they revenge upon the heel, the part that hurts them. The Ceraſtes lies in the ſand, and bites horſes and travellers heels. Gen. xlix. 17.

But the woman in the ſenſe of *eminence* is the Virgin Mary, her ſeed is Jeſus born of her without the concurrence of man. He bruiſed Satan's head, gave a deadly wound to his empire, when he ſuffered in the heel of the fleſh. Myſtically the woman is the church, her ſeed are all ſaints born in and of her, between whom and Satan and all his adherents there is a bitter enmity. The woman's doom, "I will greatly multiply thy conception," &c. only makes what was natural, penal, and what might have been changed for the better if, ſhe had not ſinned, become unalterably fixed. She was naturally ſubject to her huſband, being made for him, and not he for her. I. Cor. viii. 9. But this became penal for being firſt in the tranſgreſſion. I. Tim. ii. 12.

Laſtly, man's doom, "And unto Adam he ſaid," &c. Here is all the temporal, ſpiritual, and eternal puniſhment of Adam's ſin on himſelf and deſcendants. What would have been the courſe of nature is made penal, and what might have been otherwiſe eſtabliſhed if he had not ſinned, is ſettled to his diſadvantage *as to this world*, but as to the *next world*, it is a wiſe and benevolent conſtitution, cauſing more to ſeek to return home, than would have done, if all things had been more agreeable. Natural evil becomes a moral good. It was only temporal or natural death, threatened and inflicted, and affected only the animal part that was then created: every ſon and daughter of Adam ſuffer it; and Chriſt delivers none from it, and reſtores to nothing poſſeſſed in Adam, but to ſomething better. That a natural man ſhould induce on himſelf and his deſcendants ſpiritual and eternal evils, or have been capable of meriting like benefits, is contrary to reaſon and ſcripture. He had nothing ſpiritual to loſe, had no promiſe of what is eternal if he obeyed. "And thou ſhalt ſurely die," amounts to no more than, "Duſt thou art, and unto duſt ſhalt thou return." As Adam was only a figure of Chriſt, ſo were his things figurative of ſpiritual. If he had never ſinned he could no more have conveyed the divine life by ordinary generation, if he had been poſſeſſed of it, as he was not, than he could have created a world. The doctrine of repreſentative, or hereditary ſin or holineſs, merits contempt. The regenerate now cannot beget holy offspring, much leſs could the natural animal Adam. As our evils in nature come by the firſt Adam, ſo our ſpiritual good, come by the ſecond, and this ſhews how, not as was the offence, ſo alſo is the free gift, but that where ſin abounded unto temporal or natural death, grace doth much more abound unto eternal life. Rom. v. 12. to the end.

The reſtraint laid upon the courſe of nature during man's trial being removed upon his ſin, the reign of concupiſcence in

animal nature is introduced, and what was *innocent*, became *ſinful* fleſh : a body of ſin and death is our natural inheritance from him. It may be conſidered as our infelicity but not our fault, and it may be the occaſion of greater good : but if it occaſion us to follow his ſteps, it becomes our own ſin, and we muſt die for it, except the grace of God, Chriſt's redemption, and our repentance, prevent.

After God had pronounced ſentence upon the man and woman, he clothes them with coats of ſkins of beaſts ſlain, moſt probably in their rencounters, through the enmity now ſuffered to operate, for ſacrifices were not yet introduced.

He next expels them their garden with theſe ironical words, "Behold the man is become as one of us," &c. If they had incurred ſpiritual and eternal death for themſelves and all their unborn race, he would never have treated them in this ironical manner. Being expelled, he ſets cherubims with a flaming ſword turning every way to keep the way of the tree of life. This tree we ſuppoſe was placed there to remind them of the life their ſpirits had loſt, and now wanted, and that it was only to be recovered by Chriſt, whom it typified.

The hiſtory of the bible aſcends no higher than to a typical introduction of chriſtianity, nor to any creation but what was connected with that introduction, and it not only infers *that* not to be the firſt creation of God, but alſo that the ſpirits of men not being then created, but before produced, were now lapſed into animal bodies, whereby the creature is ſubjected to vanity by God, not willingly, for their renovation and vindication into the liberty of God's children.

That ſouls are now loſt is evident in that Chriſt came to ſeek that which was loſt : and it is certain God did not create them loſt. How to account for this loſs hath puzzled divines, and they have attempted this by three modes of the origination of human ſpirits : ſee Dr. Doddridge's Lectures, and Dr. Edward's Theologia Reformata, and others.

Theſe three modes of the origination of human ſouls or ſpirits ſhall be enquired into, and every one be left to follow the full perſuaſion of their own minds.

The firſt hypotheſis is that of the traduction of the ſpirits of men in conjunction with their ſouls and bodies.

This ſuppoſes the whole of man was created in Adam, and that according to the conſtitution of God, he propagated whole ſpirit, ſoul and body. But it hath been validly proved that the immortal ſpirit was not then created either in Adam or Eve, nor is there the leaſt intimation in that hiſtory that they have ſpirits by any thing then produced. They were of the earth earthy, with living ſouls, and ſo were other animals. Eccl. iii. 18, 19, 20. A ſexual difference in ſpirits, and their union by marriage, and propagation of their ſpecies by a conjunct ſeminal vital principle, are all unrational and unſcriptural, and contrary to all our ideas of ſpirits, rendering them diviſible and corruptible, and material. God is ever repreſented as the Father of ſpirits, and men only the fathers of our fleſh. And it is as abſurd to ſuppoſe the latter to be fathers of our ſpirits, as it would be to ſuppoſe the former to be the father of our fleſh. Beſides, if this was the caſe, the unregenerate would propagate the unregenerate, but the regenerate would propagate regenerate children, becauſe if every like produces its like, they muſt beget ſuch as are like themſelves at the time of propagation. And if Adam begat Seth in his own likeneſs after his regeneration, he was an holy ſeed like to Abel. This is the carnal hypotheſis of ſuch as think that if Adam had ſtood, he would have conveyed eternal life and happineſs to all his poſterity by natural generation, but ſince he fell he conveys ſpiritual and eternal death to them as their federal head by a ſpecial conſtitution of God. This confounds the births of bloods, of the will of the fleſh, of the will of man and of God. God could have no human ſons or daughters but through the will of man,

The conſtitution of God reaches to only animal and terreſtrial things, that every thing ſhould produce its likeneſs.

The ſecond hypotheſis concerning human ſpirits is that of their ſucceſſive or immediate creation. That it is created by infuſion, and infuſed by creation, is the opinion of many, as well as the two before mentioned Doctors.

To this it is objected that neither Adam's ſpirit nor Eve's were made in the ſix days creation: but if they were God did not finiſh creation in the ſix days, but is continuing it ever ſince, without any account of its beginning in them, or being continued in their deſcendants. A main objection to this is, that it doth not ſolve the difficulty that is to be got over, even how they come to be now loſt. For they muſt be created *with* or *without original righteouſneſs.*

If they are created with holineſs, and have the life of God, or the divine nature, when they enter theſe bodies, why are they ſo unequally yoked? why have they not ſpiritual bodies, and a celeſtial habitation? and why are they locally ſubjected to Satan, the god of this world, placed in his territories and *beneath* him? Theſe are queſtions that have not been, and cannot be anſwered, conſiſtent with the goodneſs and even juſtice of God. To make them holy and expoſe them as they are here, for nothing, is very unlikely He would do.

But if they are now created without original righteouſneſs, or God's holy image, which is the opinion of many, it muſt be in a ſtate between holineſs and ſin, that is of innocence, or in a ſtate of ſin.

The former of theſe ſuppoſitions, viz. that they are now created innocent when they enter theſe bodies, hath been proved to be contrary to the original ſtate of all rationals, as they could not then be fit ſubjects of God's kingdom, or of ſociety with him.

The more uſual and general opinion among the ſelf-reputed

orthodox is, that the ſouls of men are now created without ſanctity, in a ſtate of ſin and miſery. They ſay the ſin of Adam is propagated morally by imputation : that he was a repreſentative and federal Head of his poſterity, and that by his ſin he merited for all his offspring the deſtitution of original righteouſneſs, and that God, in creating ſpirits, deprives them of it, imputing Adam's ſin to them, which deprivation is on God's part puniſhment, and on their part ſin original, being the want of that life which ought to be in every ſoul, and they ſuppoſe to have been in Adam's ſoul.

The whole of this fabric is baſeleſs. No ſuch federal headſhip ever did belong to Adam : and no ſuch imputation is ſcriptural or juſt, nor was Adam created holy. The imputation of one man's ſin and virtue to another is no doctrine of ſcripture, nor is it agreeable to reaſon, nor is it juſt. Adam was only the *natural head of men*, I. Cor. xv. 46. and therefore none but natural evils deſcend to his poſterity through his default. That he ſhould be entruſted with the fate of all ſouls which never exiſted in his ſoul, any more than his ſoul exiſted in theirs, is abſurd to ſuppoſe : or that a natural animal head ſhould be conſtituted a repreſentative to them in ſpirituals when they never choſe him, be made ſinners by a crime they did not commit, never conſented to, are ſorry for, and condemn, and would have prevented if it had been in their power, are ſentiments ſo ſhocking and abſurd that a name is wanting to expreſs them by. But what is worſt of all, the holy God is brought, in creating ſouls graceleſs and children of the devil, to increaſe his enemy's ſubjects, and repleniſh his empire with rebels, and alſo inflicting upon them the dreadful plagues of ſpiritual blindneſs, pravity and death, the loſs of God, and heaven, and ſubjection to hell, who had done nothing to deſerve it, and who had rather have their ſpiritual concerns and eternal intereſts in their own hands, than in the hands of any creature. By

this ſcheme the holy God is made the author of ſin by way of phyſical efficiency: For if the queſtion is aſked, how came theſe ſouls thus marred? the anſwer muſt be, God made them ſo; and ſin, which is as perſonal as identity or conſciouſneſs, is made transferable like goods and chattels. Faith and repentance, ignorance and knowledge, might be imputed as well as ſin, when they are inherent in one, ſo as to belong to another. And when transferred, not adhere to the firſt, but cleave to the laſt. For if one's ſin is imputed to another, he himſelf ought to be free, becauſe it is unjuſt that the ſame ſin ſhould be accounted for twice by two different perſons, when but one was the committer, and the other had not made it his own by any paſt act of his. What one hath done may be the occaſion of actual ſin in another, and until then it is not imputable.

The third way of accounting for the deſtitution of ſpiritual light and life in the ſpirits of men, as now coming into the world, is by ſuppoſing the preexiſtence of ſouls, and their lapſe from original ſanctity, antecedent to their partaking of fleſh and blood.

This was the moſt ancient and generally diffuſed hypotheſis in ancient times, and under different forms and with ſome errors mixed therewith, was almoſt or quite univerſally entertained. It is chiefly through a faulty notion of it that many moderns have rejected it. To prevent the charge of novelty many eminent pagans, jews, and chriſtians, might be produced, and alſo as authorities, if there was any authority beſides reaſon, ſcripture, common ſenſe, and the analogy of things. Pythagoras, Plato, Ariſtotle, Triſmegiſt, the Egyptian Gymnoſophiſts, the Indian Brachmins, and Perſian Magi, Empedocles, Cebes, Euripides, Euclid, Tully, Virgil, Hippocrates, Galen Plotinus, Proclus, Jamblichus, Cardan, Finelius, and the writer of the wiſdom of Solomon, with the generality of the Jews. And among chriſtian fathers are Clement, Origen, Arnobius,

Prudentius, Syneſius, &c. on this ſide of the queſtion. And rightly ſtated, this doctrine appears to be the truth. That all ſpirits were produced at once, all with original righteouſneſs, each independent of the other, that heaven was their native place, the holy, ſpiritual, moral law, the covenant of life between God and them, and that ſome angels, and all that order of ſpirits called human ſouls, fell, and loſt the divine nature in which they exiſted. And theſe are the children of the Father of ſpirits, now made partakers of fleſh and blood, the creature ſubject to vanity not willingly, by God in hope of deliverance from the bondage of corruption, by the renovation and redemption of Chriſt, who came to ſeek and ſave what was loſt: This hypotheſis accounts for the ſilence of ſcripture hiſtory concerning the creation of ſpirits, and vindicates the character of God, and the faithfulneſs of Moſes as an hiſtorian: This beſt agrees with the economy of Adam, the ſpirits and bodies of men are more equally yoked, and the wiſdom, goodneſs and even grace of God, are hereby moſt illuſtriouſly diſplayed. It gives us juſt and rational ideas of the original creation and kingdom of God: and the holy, ſpiritual, moral law, hath its proper place as once a covenant of life between God and rationals, which it never was in this world. It accounts for the foreordination of Chriſt before the foundation of the world, and our being choſen in him from that time. It rationally accounts for all ſymbols, figures and types of Chriſt, and heavenly things in the paradiſaical economy; and even for the whole Moſaic creation itſelf as a figure of the new creation of God. Every thing in that creation is terreſtrial and animal, formed out of preexiſtent materials in a chaotic ſtate. The ſhining of the light out of darkneſs typifies Chriſt's ſhining as the light of the world, in the darkneſs of man's unregeneracy, and the darkneſs comprehending it not. The *ſunleſs* day light before the appearance of the natural ſun, fitly repreſents the

obſcurity of old teſtament times as to ſpiritual light, till Chriſt the ſun of righteouſneſs aroſe; as that light came from the ſun not yet ſhining through the chaos, ſo alſo all the ſpiritual light of men there proceeded from Chriſt the true light, as to come. This alſo accounts for the priority of darkneſs to light, the exiſtence of natural evil in the Moſaic creation, the difference between the kinds of beaſts and plants, evil and good, poiſonous and ſalutary. The figures and adumbrations in paradiſe look backward and forward, the earthly paradiſe itſelf figured the paradiſe above that had been loſt, and that to come which Chriſt reſtores to: man's innocence was a figure of original righteouſneſs loſt, and of *renewed* holineſs to be expected. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil, adumbrates the original ſin of rationals and its bitter fruits, as the tree of life doth that life of God ſouls were alienated from, and its reſtoration by Chriſt, who came that we might have life. Theſe and many more correſpondences are not accidental but deſigned, not unmeaning but inſtructive. Here we ſee how more is gained by Chriſt than was loſt by Adam: and where the prodigal was before his return, what occaſioned his return, even his uncomfortable ſituation in a ſtrange land, the citizen he was joined to, even the god of this world, and that his return is not to Adam's paradiſe, but to God and heaven. Here the loſt ſheep was in the fold of God before it ſtrayed, and not in Adam's paradiſe, which was no place of ſecurity from the jaws of the roaring lion, or the wiles of the ſubtle ſerpent. This world never was deſigned as a habitation for holy rationals, but for the trial of ſuch lapſed rationals as we are. It is now, and was from the beginning Satan's territory; within its boundaries is all the hell that ever was or will be. II. Pet. iii. 7. Here ſouls are in exile and baniſhment, as appears from the common language of mankind, even when the ſpeakers think or mean not ſo. We find it in authors that

heaven is our native place, that good men at death go home, &c. Divines have attributed a heavenly, ſpiritual, holy condition to Adam, and have ſuppoſed he fell from ſuch a ſtate, which his earthly paradiſe by no means was. Sober perſons have thought ſouls heaven born, that their cognation and affinity is with things ſupernal, and certainly they once dwelt with their kindred things. And as to ſcripture proof of this doctrine, beſides what hath been advanced, we read of morning ſtars and ſons of God, joyful and tuneful ſpectators of this world's creation: Job xxxviii. 7. And theſe ſons are no doubt the children partakers of fleſh and blood, Heb. ii. 14. for fleſh and blood doth not conſtitute them the offspring or children of God, but ranks them with beaſts. Eccleſ. iii. 18, 19, 20. Rom. viii. 19, 20, &c. It appears the diſciples were of this opinion in their queſtion, "Who did ſin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" And our Savior's anſwer denies not his preexiſtence, but corrects an error too commonly entertained, that ſins in a former ſtate were the cauſes of his blindneſs in this. John ix. 3. The truth is they are ſent here not to puniſh but reſtore them. We are ſubject to more evils than can be accounted for by the lapſe of Adam. Divines have tried long enough to effect this with their irrational and unſcriptural ſchemes. The little frivolous objections, that none remember their lapſe or exiſtence in their prior ſtate, that it is unjuſt to puniſh us for what we are not conſcious of, &c. operate as ſtrongly againſt any puniſhment for Adam's ſin. But men do ſuffer for what they do not remember, as natural and temporal evils for Adam's ſin. When any ſuffer in a *courſe of law*, the crime muſt be noticed, evidence produced, and they will be conſcious of it, if guilty: but the caſe is otherwiſe when they are puniſhed *in a courſe of nature*. We are not ſent here to puniſh us temporally for Adam's ſin, yet we ſuffer the conſequences of *that*, and of the

loſs of original righteouſneſs, and will forever ſuffer them until renewed and reſtored by Chriſt. The want of holineſs is an incapacity for heaven, and it is better to ſuppoſe it comes by our own fault than to attribute it to our Maker or to Adam. There are many manſions in God's creation where theſe ſpirits may be now exiſting, and ſuffering the natural conſequences of their preſent loſs, waiting their turns to enter bodies of fleſh and blood fitted for them to take their trial in, according to the preſent benevolent conſtitution of God. We know not how ſeparate ſpirits act, remember or are conſcious, yet the penal evils we now ſuffer, infer more criminal evils than can be accounted for by the lapſe of the earthy Adam, and ſo ſerve to confirm the above hypotheſis. As it is, every one is left to judge for himſelf, and to be fully perſuaded in his own mind God's preſent kingdom of heaven is new and mediatorial, there muſt have been an original kingdom prior to this. And as Chriſt is come to reſtore all things, and we are reſtored to nothing in Adam, it muſt be to ſomething prior to him, and therefore the Moſaic creation was not the firſt creation of God.

From the premiſes in this chapter may be inferred the preſent natural ſtate of man, which is his *heathen* (Mat. xviii. 17.) *condition*, into which the lapſe of ſouls and the lapſe of Adam in conjunction have plunged him.

1. It involves in it ignorance of God in his true character. The unregenerate and regenerate have not *ſpecifically* the ſame God, any more than jews and chriſtians have the ſame Meſſiah, or mahometans and chriſtians the ſame paradiſe, &c.

2. Men are naturally without God in the world. Eph. ii. 12. The beſt among heathen were only human moraliſts, and the worſt diabaliſts. I. Cor. x. 20.

3. Men naturally are carnal in a ſtate of death. John iii. 6. Rom. viii. 6. They derive in the courſe of nature *a body*

*of ſin and death* from the firſt Adam, called alſo *ſinful fleſh*; which is a vital nature ſpontaneously parturient of ſin, in which no good *dwelleth*. Rom. vii. 18.

This death in treſpaſſes and ſins is a deſtitution of and alienation from the life of God, and a ſubjection to ſuch evils as are death to the ſpiritual life of the ſoul. Natural death only comes by Adam, ſpiritual death is the ſoul's loſs of the divine nature: the ſecond death comes for rejecting the ſecond Adam. Men are repreſented as dead when the goſpel is firſt preached to them, that they may be *judged*, ſuffer mortification, and a death to ſin, *according to men in fleſh, but live according to God in ſpirit*. I. Pet. iv. 1. to comp. Rom. vi. 1, 2. Thus we are to underſtand *Chriſt's being put to death in fleſh*, but quickened in ſpirit, &c. I. Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20. After Chriſt's ſuffering in fleſh, and reſurrection by the ſpirit, by his ſpirit in the Apoſtles, he went and *preached* to *ſpirits in priſon*, &c. Eph. ii. 17: that is ſouls in the priſons of theſe bodies, deſtitute of ſpiritual life. The wicked when naturally dead are ſpirits in priſon. Mat. xviii. 30. And the dead in ſins are captives in *priſon alſo*. Iſa. lxi. 1. Luke iv. 18. Theſe were ſometime diſobedient *as* they were to whom Noah preached. The preaching of Chriſt being after his reſurrection, not in his own perſon, but by his ſpirit in the apoſtles, it deſtroys the falſe gloſſes that have been put upon this text. The dead in ſin, do things worthy of death, are ſervants of ſin unto death, and ſhall die. They bring forth fruit unto death: and as the wages of ſin is death, they muſt be put to death, the law and ſin reign over them to death, and the devil alſo who hath the power of death. Rom. i. 32. vi. 6. vii. 5. viii. 13. John iii. 36.

4. Men in their now natural eſtate are in darkneſs under the power of Satan. Acts xxvi. 18.

As the knowledge of true religion depends much upon

knowing Satan's kingdom of evil, and common ſyſtems take little or no notice of it, it ſhall be deſcribed in its head, polity, ſubjects and territory.

That there is ſuch a being as we call Satan or the Devil, not originally ſo but now ſo by his abuſe of liberty, and who is an adverſary to God and foe to man, and who hath numerous ſubjects among thoſe of his own order, and alſo among men, the exiſtence of moral evil in the world proves: for evil of this kind muſt have a cauſe and author, which God cannot be, as it is directly repugnant to his nature as the *Holy One*. Chriſtianity affirms a God of this world as well as a God of heaven; the laſt exiſts neceſſarily, the former as he is now by defection and ſelf creation, and reigns by uſurpation, not without the permiſſion or ſubjection to the control of the God of Gods. Satan, as god of this world, is prince of other devils, and is denominated prince of the power of the air, and ruler of the darkneſs of this world: placed from the beginning in an aerial heavenly ſituation above and over men. They have acquired a ſtate of ſovereignty over the ungodly, and as one mighty ſpirit work energetically in the children of diſobedience. Eph. ii. 2. Their ſuperior ſtate to men, their ſpiritual nature, exact order, great ſtrength, refined policy, long experience and indefatigable diligence, render them more than a match for men, and they would domineer over them at their pleaſure, if they were not controled.

An irreligious empire was and is the Devil's deſign and intereſt, and through the influence of error, falſhood and wickedneſs he maintains a cruel deſpotiſm over his vaſſals; with the world and men's luſts on his ſide he works efficaciouſly, and with ſtrong deluſions carrying captive at his will. Sometimes he acts the ſerpent, and ſometimes the lion, or the bloody dragon, but always the adverſary and deſtroyer. Thus the whole world hath been deceived, and brought to lye in wicked-

neſs. The bloody dragon, the pagan roman beaſt, makes the panther-like papal beaſt his ſucceſſor, and gives him his *power and great authority*. Rev. xiii. 2.

1. The ſubjection of the world of men to Satan may be conſidered as penal.

He hath the *power of death* Heb. ii. 14. accruing to him by the law through man's ſin, and it is ſo far legal, as the law commits ſinners into his hands, conſidered as executioner of the divine juſtice. That men have been ſubject to diabolical poſſeſſions and infeſtations is plain from ſcripture. Demons are of different ſorts fitted to different employments; ſome draw evil ſpirits to aſſociate with them, and they enter them as naturally as infection doth people in peſtilential times, prediſpoſed to catch the contagion. Diabolical poſſeſſions are liable to wilful impoſture, or innocent miſtake, yet the reality of them cannot be denied: they prevailed much in Chriſt's time. Some not ſuperſtitious have attributed ſome diſeaſes, eſpecially a kind of epilepſy and ſeveral kinds of manianiſm to the *oppression of the devil*. Acts, 10. 38.

2. Mankind are naturally under Satan's power by way of *criminal* ſubjection.

Wicked men no more live out of ſociety with the inviſible world than holy men do: there is the communion of devils as well as of ſaints. The wicked or evil one is the immoral father of all of that character. They have turned *aſide after Satan*. I. Tim. v. 15. He firſt founded the trump of rebellion and they have joined his ſtandard. He rules the men and nations who do his will: his empire is commenſurate with the reign of ſin, and no leſs invincible. Where wickedneſs prevails, is his *ſeat, throne and reſidence*. Rev, ii. 13. The whole world without the church *lieth in him*. I. John, v. 19. He operates in the children of diſobedience by inſpiration, afflation, internal motions, perſuaſion and ſuggeſtion: and they are more or

leſs actuated by an evil ſpirit, who blinds their minds ſtirs up their appetites, inflames their paſſions and drives them into *wickedneſs*. II. Pet. ii. 19. As Tubal Cain was the father of them who handle the harp and organ, ſo is the devil the father of ſinners, the inventer of their trade which is *diaboliſm*, I. John iii. 8. and ſome are called by his name. John, vi. 70.

3. The whole world without the church hath been, and ſtill is under Satan's domination by way of criminal religious ſubjection.

Every ſpecies of falſe religion is in a degree Satanical. In religion men have ſought out many inventions, not without the devil's aid, and influence, as the *kinds* of religion they have invented demonſtrate. Some modern deniers of revelation have attributed theſe impoſitions to *prieſtcraft*, taking advantage of the eaſy credulity of the vulgar to lead them aſide: but theſe vulgar ſhall be proved to have been the greateſt ſages of antiquity. The religions which have prevailed in the world beſides God's true religion, were *devil'scraft*, and ſure evidences of his godſhip over this world. No other religion than this ever did prevail in the world without the church of God. All in falſe religions is not clear diaboliſm, yet his *foot mark* is plainly ſeen in them.

1. In the ſpecific nature and character of the ſupreme and ſubordinate deities of worldly religions, there is a proof of Satan's godſhip over this world. The heathen, according to Varro, had three hundred Jupiters, and each of theſe had a religion according to his kind. None of theſe was the true God, but their real Jove was the devil, and their ſubordinate deities were, as Celſus calls them, *aerial and terreſtrial great rulers*, the ſame with *the principalities and powers* of the kingdom of darkneſs. As devils were the objects of the worſhip of the *idolatrous jews*, Levit. xvii. 7. Deut. xxxvii. 17. Pſ. xcvi. 5. ſeptuagint. much more of the heathen. Their

doctrines, cups, altars, libations, and prieſts, were of devils; 1. Cor. x. 21. The immortal gods that Cicero ſo often invokes were devils, and ſo were all the deities of Rome pagan. And nothing was ſo intolerable to theſe deities as God's religion. The initiated by baptiſm were made to *renounce the prince of this world, his pomps and vices*, &c.

2. Another evidence of Satan's godſhip over this world is the mighty veneration all but God's religioniſts have had for *ſerpents*.

Not man's natural antipathy to ſerpents, nor the noxious venenate qualities of that reptile, ever reſtrained any nation in ancient times, excepting the Jews, from worſhipping of the ſerpent and reputing it ſacred. The Indians, Egyptians, Babylonians, &c. were all from time immemorial ſerpent worſhippers. The Chineſe, Ethiopians and Americans ſtill worſhip him. When Adrian built a temple to Jupiter at Athens, the Sebaſma or deity he put into it was a ſerpent brought out of India. A ſerpent was the ſymbol of the Egyptian Serapis: the initiated into the Sabazian Sacra, had a golden ſerpent put into their boſom. Herodotus mentions ſacred ſerpents about Thebes, which dying were buried in their father Jupiter's temple. A live ſerpent was the ſymbol of Eſculapius: when a peſtilence raged at Rome a ſolemn embaſſy was ſent to Epidaurus for the ſymbol of Eſculapius, when a ſerpent came, and St. Auguſtine ſaith the devil was tranſported to Rome in his own ſhape. A ſerpent was kept in Minerva's temple, and when that was gone the Athenians thought their goddeſs was departed. A dragon kept the Athenian fortreſs, and the ſtandard bearers were called *draconarii*, from whence the Engliſh dragoon is derived. The devil was well known in the learned, polite, philoſophic city of Athens, where the true God was unknown. Apollo the Apollyon of ſcripture was called Pythius, from Pethon a ſerpent. In general, among the heathen, unclean beaſts and

birds and ſuch as lived on prey were ſacred to their deities, which is a ſure evidence of their being religioniſts of an evil and unclean ſpirit.

3. Human ſacrifices and the bloody rites of heatheniſm are a farther evidence of Satan's godſhip over this world.

All, whoſe religion admits of theſe barbarous rites, are the religioniſts of that murderer from the beginning. A mighty field of ſlaughter here opens, and an appearance not to be accounted for by the common principles of humanity. Even animal ſacrifices, to expiate ſin, originated not from nature, but from divine revelation, inſtituted to prefigure the ſacrifice of the Meſſiah. But the ſacrificing fellow beings, and giving the fruits of their bodies for the ſin of their ſouls is the devil's inſtitution.

Plutarch tells us that they offered human ſacrifices to appeaſe the anger of direful demons. If prieſtcraft invented and ſupported this cuſtom, their genius and influence was ſuperior to what it is in modern times. For if thoſe were times of ignorance when the cuſtom was introduced, it affected prieſts as much as others: and the moſt enlightened and philoſophic pagans practiſed it. The fact will not be denied that the Canaanites and the Carthagenians their deſcendants ſacrificed their own children, and ſuch as had none bought them for the purpoſe, and their mothers ſtood by to behold the tragedy, and if they cried or ſighed while it was acting, they loſt their price, but the child was not ſpared. Pipes and drums were uſed to drown the infants' ſhrieks, and the valley of tophet had its name from a tabret or drum thus uſed. The ſpread of this barbarous practice in the four parts of the world ſhows the extent of the devil's godſhip. In America at a certain ſolemnity they ſacrificed two hundred young children at once, and many thouſands yearly. Their dark houſes, full of idols, were bathed in the blood of men, as Purchas informs. None

but prieſts or great perſonages entered theſe ſlaughter-houſes of Apollyon, and when they entered a man was ſlain, for the prieſts to waſh their hands in, and ſprinkle the houſe with the blood of the victim. Ariſthomines Meſſenius ſacrificed three hundred men at once to Jove. Surely this was the Jove adored by the ſavage, not the ſaint. Here might be added their bloody rites, the initiation into the myſteries of Mithras by fourſcore torments, their cutting themſelves with knives, the ſpectacles of the gladiators, &c.

4. The ſorcery, wizzardiſm and magic of the heathen prove Satan's godſhip over this world.

The magicians of Egypt are well known: that ſuch diabolical arts exiſted, not only ſcripture, but all heathen antiquity, and the laws of the beſt regulated ſtates proves. Various kinds of ſorcery were forbid the Jews, Exod. ix. 11. Deut. xviii. 19. and they continued after the riſe of chriſtianity. Rev. ix. 21. Simon Magus, Apollonius, Tyaneus, and Julian the apoſtate were magicians. Pliny owns that magic prevailed through the world, was a ſcience reputed ſacred, and was the ſummity of learning. It was the wiſdom of the orientals, and ſpread even to Britain, and was taught in Egypt as ſacerdotal learning. A familiar ſpirit is *ob* in Hebrew, becauſe the anſwer was like one ſpeaking out of the belly in a low hollow tone, by peeping and muttering. Iſa. xxix. 4. and viii. 19. Acts, xvi. 6. The conſulters of Teraphion and necromancers were anſwered. Iſa. lxv. 4. Hoſea, iv. 12. Ezek. xxi. 21. The heathen had prophets who ſpake by diabolical inſpiration, and predicted events. Titus, i. 12. Sorcery and magic prevailed among jews and chriſtians, Acts, xiii. 6, 8. and much of popery conſiſts in it: their exorciſms, crucifixes, beads, holy waters, &c. are of this kind. This may be called the heathen world's atteſtation to the truth of the ſcriptures, and to one half of the chriſtian religion, even

the account it gives of the devil's worldly kingdom, and of man's religious ſubjection to him. The moſt philoſophic and beſt moral pagans were magicians or addicted that way. Marcus Antonius, Orpheus, Zoroaſter, Pythagoras, Epimenides, Zamolxis, and even Socrates and Plato. To theſe may be added, as of the magical kind, Porphyry, Jamblichus, Celſus, Plotinus, Cicero, Seneca and Epictetus. Lord Shaftſbury diſcovers a ſuperſtitious magical turn in the reaſon he gives for publiſhing his works.—Leland's view of Deiſt Writers.

5. The oracles and miracles in heatheniſm are a farther evidence of Satan's worldly godſhip.

For after all due allowance is made for fraud, and credulity, there was much of reality in both of them; for to ſuppoſe all their oracles and miracles were counterfeits reflects hard upon the learned pagans, contradicts the ſcripture and the faith of God's church. The heathen Teraphim, which word occurs fifteen times in ſcripture, were oracular, anſwering to the holy Urim and Thummim. Zech. x. 2. Their idols ſpake or the devil in them; one idol is called Nebo as being prophetic: and by them *doctrines of devils were* delivered. I. Tim. iv. 1. As the jewiſh religion was not of their own deviſing, but of God's; ſo the Devil invented the pagan's religion to ape God. Initial judaiſm was from the firſt ſacrifice by divine inſtitution, old gentiliſm was that judaiſm corrupted by a mixture of the devil's inſtitutes with the revelation given to Adam and Noah the heads of two worlds, when revelation was twice univerſal. There never was any nation or people who had any religion, and all have had ſome, but they derived it from a real or ſuppoſed revelation. Moſaic judaiſm is oppoſed to what exiſted in paganiſm, and was corrupt. Jewiſh prieſts and prophets anſwer to the like among pagans, and their oracles alſo anſwer to each other. Deut. xviii. 9, 12, 15. The wiſeſt heathen had a high veneration for their oracles: ſome prieſts were

perſonal oracles, who conſulted the devil and gave anſwers from him. Barjeſus was the devil's prophet, called Elymas in Syriac, which is the ſon of a ſecret. Acts xiii. 6. xvi. 16. The local oracles of the heathen are well known.

And as to *miracles* we have ſcripture proof of theſe among pagans in the magicians of Egypt, and we read of ſpirits of devils working miracles, which were no doubt real. Rev. xvi. 14. Deut. xiii. 1, 2. Celſus and Plutarch have written much in favor of heathen oracles and miracles. Without them Satan never could have eſtabliſhed and maintained the heathen religion. Never would they have worſhipped ſerpents, and offered up human ſacrifices contrary to the inſtincts of nature without oracles requiring them. The Mexican prieſts, by the devil's ſuggeſtion, tell their kings that their gods died of hunger, and then they aſſembled their armies to war, to furniſh their bloody altars. Satan uſed much art and policy to bring them into theſe practices, by oracles, divinations, prodigies and lying wonders; and, as they did not like to receive the love of the truth, or to retain God in their knowledge, he gave them over to ſtrong deluſions to believe lies. II. Theſ. ii. 9. Rev. xviii. 12. Acts viii. 10.

The ſtrange ſpurious ſanctity in the heathen worſhip is another proof of the Devil's worldly godſhip. He always affected unnatural mixtures and combinations, forbidden the jews, but prevalent among heathen. Deut. xxii. 10. Lev. xix. 19. and xxi. 19. They had their holineſs of uncleanneſs, ſanctity of ſodomy and beſtiality: in the temple of the Corinthian Venus dwelt thouſands of ſacred harlots, and men and women changed clothes for unnatural mixtures. Deut. xxii. 6. All this proves heatheniſm to be the inſtitution of an unclean ſpirit.

Another proof of Satan's godſhip over this world may be taken from the character of the Roman empire a main pillar of his kingdom.

That empire, as inſtigated by the devil, managed a long and bloody war againſt God, Chriſt, and chriſtianity, in favor of the heathen gods and religion. The tragical perſecutions and ſufferings of chriſtians, by racks, croſſes, wheels, gridirons, red hot iron chairs, brazen bulls, ungulas, and wild beaſts, ſhew that Abaddon was the actuator. As the divine ſpirit ſupported chriſtians, ſo an evil ſpirit actuated them. The conteſt was between Chriſt and the god of this world in their followers. Eph. vi. 12. I. John iv. 4. In Turtullian's apology we have this noble challenge made: "If God will have us combat again for piety, let our antagoniſts come, through Chriſt ſtrengthening us, we can do all things, let the ungulas dig us, beaſts leap upon us, the croſſes hang us, the fire burn us, the ſword cut our throats, we are prepared for all torments." Papal Rome hath equalled pagan, in its cruel meaſures to ſupport the devil's worldly empire. Satan ſtill retains his godſhip over this world without the church. To be in the world as mere citizens of it, is to be of his kingdom. Mat. xviii. 17. Acts xxvi. 18. Eph. ii. 12.

*From the holy ſpiritual moral law's being the conſtitution of God's original kingdom, may be inferred the preſent legal condition of mankind.*

This royal law, which expreſſeth the divine nature, was a covenant of life between God and unlapſed rationals, who were originally created in conformity to the ſanctity it requires. It was ordained to continue ſpiritual and eternal life while obeyed; and ſettled the rights and dues between God and his ſubjects according to legal juſtice: if perfectly obeyed, it rendered the reward, that is the continuance of life, of debt; but if tranſgreſſed, ſubjected to ſpiritual and eternal death according to the ſame meaſure. In the truth of this devils did not abide; and the human ſpecies are all alienated from the life of God it requires, and are therefore dead in law and under

the condemnation of it unto death. The natural legal condition of man is that of guilty ungodly tranſgreſſors, as they want conformity to the law, and are partakers of fleſh and blood, in which nothing ſpiritually good dwells, and are alſo ſubject to the reign of concupiſcence and a prevalent tendency to ſin.

Men's reaſon is weak, their paſſions are ſtrong, and their experience none, prior to the knowledge of good and evil, and having no holy principle, ſin reigns in all by nature. Men are born into a ſtate, and with ſuch a derived nature as is *ſinful*, by way of inclination and prevalent tendency, and become actual ſinners, where grace doth not prevent, as ſoon as they are capable of moral agency. A man may be born ſinful in the eye of the law, but can be a ſinner only by his own act. James i. 14. The former is his infelicity, the latter is his fault, and is imputable. The law being originally written in the heart, not to be eraſed but by annihilation, the law of the mind dictates what is right, but the law of ſin in the members captivates and makes a ſlave of him, as the apoſtle proves in Rom. chap. vii. The law, like ineffectual phyſic, ſtirs up bad humors, but cannot expel them. The confounding Rom. vii. with Gal. iv. 16, 17, 18, is a groſs miſtake. The ſtruggle in Galatians is between fleſh and ſpirit, the old man and new: but in Romans it is between the law of the mind, the inward man, or conſcience, and the animal nature as corrupt. The man, in Romans, is under the law, and not under grace: the man, in Galatians, is under grace, and not under the law: the latter therefore conquers, but the former is overcome. Rom. vi. 14. The other interpretation of Romans vii. applying it to the regenerate, is inconſiſtent with their *ſtate*, and repugnant to the *drift* of the apoſtle, which was to perſuade them to leave the law and come under Chriſt, which they might do, as the law was jurally dead to them, and they were dead to that by the body of Chriſt.

Again, man's natural ſtate by the law is under the curſe. Gal. iii. 10.

This completes man's natural legal condition, that it is a ſtate of condemnation unto death, without any hope of liberation by law. The law reduces man to abſolute deſpair, and therefore the goſpel is neceſſary to juſtification of life.

## CHAP. III.

### THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

*A delineation of the character of the Scriptures, as holy, popular, unphiloſophical, antimetaphyſical, and theopolitical.*

THE account that hath been given of God's original creation and kingdom, of its conſtitution, of the original, and preſent natural and legal ſtate of man, plainly evinces that no religion of nature ever was, or can be ſaving to man in this world. The reaſon is plain, man hath been always in a ſtate of degradation from the original ſtate of holy nature: neither Adam nor any of his deſcendants ever were holy as the law requires, and therefore the more perfect their knowledge of that is, the more deſperate they muſt ſee their circumſtances to be thereby. A law once tranſgreſſed can never juſtify nor ſave the tranſgreſſor: and the caſe is the ſame where there is no actual tranſgreſſion, if there is a deficiency or deſtitution of character according to the law that is the rule and meaſure of judgment in their caſe. In the preſent ſtate of man there muſt be the interpoſition of ſovereign grace, and ſuperlegal mercy, or he muſt pine away without remedy and without hope. And whether theſe may and can be conſiſtently exerciſed by a holy and juſt Lawgiver, and upon what conditions, muſt be hid in

God until revealed, becauſe they reſult from the counſel and purpoſe of his own will. They who entertain the idea of legal ſalvation to ſinners upon their repentance betray great ignorance of the nature of legal conſtitutions. Repentance is no requiſition of a proper law, nor doth it ſatisfy for any breach of law whether human or divine. Man cannot in his preſent ſtate do without a religion that is new in its *object* and *doctrine*, which therefore muſt be a revealed religion, and any that pretends not to revelation is not worth examination. The religion proper for man in his preſent ſtate muſt alſo provide a remedy for his *criminal evils*, and afford deliverance from his *penal-evils*, and be *effectual to reſtore* in man's nature that foundation for happineſs he hath now loſt. A religion that doth not propoſe theſe things can do man no good. And as the ſcripture revelation promiſeth theſe things it deſerves examination. It conſiders man as he is at preſent, and pretends to provide an adequate remedy, if applied. All therefore ought to endeavor to underſtand man's ſtate, and needed remedy, which none can do unleſs they alſo underſtand the ſpecific character of thoſe holy writings. The ſcience of ſanctity is derived from them; what hath been written and is yet to be written is ſcripturiſm explained according to reaſon, common ſenſe and the juſt analogy of things.

1. The character that determines the *ſpecific nature* of the ſcriptures is that they are *holy*.

Holineſs or ſanctity enters into the very nature of theſe writings, and is their divinity, and what diſtinguiſheth them from all others. They are frequently ſtiled the holy ſcriptures, and in the front of the book that contains them we read this ſignificant and expreſſive title, the HOLY BIBLE. This is characteriſtical of the whole book and its contents. It is the *holy word* of the holy God, written by the inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt, by *holy men*, concerning *holy matters*, and

treated of in an *holy manner*. The holy people's book, the book of the church, which is a holy polity, it teacheth the *knowledge of the holy*. Prov. xxx. 3. and ix. 10. The ſcience of ſanctity is a divine learning, to be acquired by none but the holy: it is that wiſdom which is *underſtanding*. Other ſciences are common and profane, as converſant about other ſubjects. Such are the ſciences of ontology, philoſophy, philology, logic, mathematics, &c. and however good and uſeful they may be in themſelves, are ſpecifically different from that divine erudition the holy ſcriptures teach. And whenever any alluſion is made in that divine book to other ſciences, they are ever to be diſtinguiſhed in their kind and quality from the ſcience of theology. The ſcriptures are holy *objectively* and *ſubjectively*; even the hiſtorical parts are either of holy people or of others as connected with them. Their genealogies, chronology, geography, &c. are thus to be conſidered: and their uſe, deſign and effect is holineſs. Holineſs in the ſtudent of them is the beſt qualification for underſtanding them: for they are the book of holy men committed unto them as a ſacred depoſitory.

By this title *holy*, it is intended that they are neither philoſophical, metaphyſical, ſcholaſtical, or logical. "Beware leſt any man ſpoil you through philoſophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of this world, and not after Chriſt," Coloſſ. ii. 8. was a caution then needed, and which hath been, and is as little minded, in the interpretation of ſcripture, as any one in all the bible, to the infinite damage of the ſcience of ſanctity. Biſhop Taylor in his Duct. Dub. long ago ſaid, "That the chriſtian ſchools drew ſome of their articles through the limbecks of Plato's philoſophy, and the reliſh remains upon them to this day." And another knowing writer ſaith, "Some of the philoſophers became chriſtians upon the riſe of chriſtianity, eſpecially of the platonic ſect, and

coming into the church, left not their platonism behind them, but transferred many things from their philosophy into the christian religion, particularly in the doctrine of the trinity, and the incarnation of Jesus Christ." And it will appear hereafter that the reputed orthodox doctrines of the trinity, the logos, &c. are deduced from the writings of Plato, Philo, and the Jewish Rabbins, the worst of all interpreters, and not from the holy scriptures. It hath been taken for granted that the primitive fathers living nearer to the apostles, must for that reason be better interpreters of scripture than any since, and under the influence of this persuasion many have implicitly followed these men, spoilt through philosophy, to the infinite damage and perversion of the scriptures and the faith of christians. The same charge lies against the paying that deference to the authority of the leaders in the reformation which hath been commonly done, as if they were almost or quite an infallible standard of truth. Their scholastic creeds and catechisms are both void of divinity and good sense in describing the only true God as a perfect essence consisting of three persons; and him whom he hath sent as a compound person consisting of two intelligencies, and two personalities. And their doctrine of the trinity, which babes in Christ are initiated into the belief of, is full of inconsistency and confusion. God's reigning estate, his kingdom, and Satan's godship over this world, are altogether unnoticed, and logical subtilties, and metaphysical quiddities are substituted in the room of important realities. The business of religion is made to consist in metaphysical disputes, the worst men may be the best at it, and none are bettered by it. Now the chief cause hereof is profound *ignorance* of the specific character of the *bible*, the only repository of this holy science.

To prevent all mistakes about what hath been written above, a distinction must be made between the two kinds of philosophy

which do exiſt, the one *popular* and *practical*, the other *ſcholaſtical* and *ſpeculative*. The former was learned by men of a politic and practic life, the latter by men of a recluſe ſcholaſtic life. The firſt conſiſts in ethics, politics, economics, agriculture and the mechanic arts: and to theſe belong the principality, the prieſthood, the matters of religion, government, and common life. This kind of philoſophy is no enemy to divinity, though a diſtinct ſcience from it. But the other was confined to the ſchools where logic, metaphyſics, phyſiology, philology, Grecian rhetoric and eloquence were taught, ſciences no ways contributing to a good life, but rather ſerving to fill the head with ſubtilties and to obſcure the truth. It was taught in the ſchools of Plato, Ariſtotle, Pythagorus, &c. and revived by Thomas Aquinas, Dons Scotus, Peter Lombard, &c. It never made any better for their acquaintance with it, but many worſe. The Eſſenes were of this character among the Jews, whom Joſephus celebrates, but our Savior doth not mention as any kind of religious ſect. Men of this philoſophy moſt oppoſed chriſtianity, and if any embraced it, they corrupted it. It is a *vain deceit*; the apoſtle calls the *wiſe men* of this world and its tenets the *wiſdom of the world that comes to nought*: and they accounted the doctrine of Chriſt crucified *fooliſhneſs*. While the ſcriptures expreſs mathematical learning, mechanical wiſdom, human politics, and ſome branches of natural philoſophy, it ſaith nothing of metaphyſics, or of any other of the ſcholaſtic ſciences. They are no *hand maids* to divinity, they have no ſanctity in them, nor are they conducive to it.

2. The ſcriptures are *popular* as well as holy.

They are written for the uſe and benefit of the people, and are accommodated to their capacity. Philoſophy in the above rejected ſenſe, was only taught in their ſchools, and the common people, that is all but themſelves, were treated with ſovereign contempt by theſe worldly wiſe men, and kept at an awful

diſtance as profane. Lord Bacon calls *ethics, laws, politics and economics, the ſciences popular*, as they concern the welfare of the community of the people. Religion is the moſt popular of all ſciences, becauſe it concerns every perſon alike, the king and peaſant, to ſtudy, learn and practiſe it, for it is their *life*. The knowledge, faith and practice of teachers cannot be imputed to the learners of it. Every man muſt make the knowledge, faith and practice of religion perſonally his own. But the philoſophers were antipopular; they were never any politic ſociety themſelves, and were never better members of ſociety for their philoſophy, nor the common people worſe men or citizens for want of it. Some of them would not be chriſtians leſt they ſhould be called by the ſame name, and be commonized with the vulgar. And they carried their pride of wiſdom ſo high as to repute better men than themſelves as mere brutes, becauſe unacquainted with their ſcholaſtic ſubtilties and logical quirks. But the people might recriminate with better juſtice, and aſk, if ſcholaſtic philoſophy ever made any man wiſer or better, ever rectified any vulgar errors in religion or civil politics? Did philoſophy ever form any ſalutary ſyſtem of truth or morals embraced by any nation or people under heaven? The queſtion is yet unanſwerable in the affirmative, What good did ſchool philoſophy ever do? It ſwelled and puffed them up, and while they laughed in private at ſome parts of the eſtabliſhed religion, inſtead of making any generous efforts to effect an alteration for the better, they meanly complied in public with the vulgar ſuperſtitions. The atheiſm and ſcepticiſm bred in their ſchools, were much more pernicious than any vices of the common people. The greateſt and beſt men of Greece and Rome were popular men, brought up in no philoſophic ſchools.

Schools of philoſophers have been nurſeries of atheiſm and infidelity. God is in nature the founder, preſerver and providential governor of popular communities, as kingdoms, cities

and families, and they are for a God, providence, and rites of worſhip. But as God is no founder of philoſophic ſchools, nor his providence charged with their conſervation as ſuch, ſo they have originated ſeveral ſects and ſchemes of atheiſm, as the anaximandrian, atomical, ſtratonical, and coſmoplaſtic, &c. Theſe are the men who counted the wiſdom of God in the goſpel *fooliſhneſs*, and are in that juſtly reckoned to be *fools*. They liked not chriſtianity becauſe it did not treat of things in their logical, methodical way, nor uſe any of their technical terms. The ſcriptures treat of matters as a law and directory of life ought to do; no ſpeculative ſcience is mentioned, no deductions from the reaſon and fitneſſes of things, or from the phyſical natures of beings. Spirits ontologically may be immaterial, rational, intelligent, incorruptible, immortal, and have all the powers of agency, and yet be devils in their nature. We do not read of any *benevolence to being, or univerſal being, nor of any degrees of exiſtence*, in the holy ſcriptures. To mix philoſophy and metaphyſics with the *ſcience of ſanctity*, which are ſo heterogeneous, makes a *linſey woolſey ſyſtem*, and is no better than plowing with an ox and aſs together. The ſcriptures ever ſpeak according to common apprehenſions and viſible appearances, treating of heavenly beings and things by analogy to what is earthly, ſecluding imperfections, and preſerving a ſpecific difference between them.

All the holy writers of ſcripture were popular men, and belonged to no ſect of philoſophy, and were generally unacquainted with any exotic learning. Conſidered as *Jews* their learning was ſacred: their ſchools and colleges were only for divine erudition. The latter Jews, in proportion to their acquaintance with Grecian and Roman literature, ceaſed to be genuine Jews by philoſophizing with pagans, as Joſephus and Philo, &c. evidently do, and were *Judaical Pagan* in their character. Moſes, though verſed in the wiſdom of the Egyp-

tians, after he was raiſed to be a prophet of God to the people, makes no uſe of his profane learning. He deſcribes the creation in a popular manner, as a ſpectator would have done, ſpeaking according to common apprehenſions. He is far from aſtronomical exactneſs in his calculations; his feſtivals are fixed by moons, a precarious way of reckoning in cloudy weather, which ſubjected the prieſts to much trouble in keeping perſons upon certain mountains, to announce by ſound of trumpet the firſt appearance of the new moon.

Conſidering the holy writers as apoſtles, prophets, or evangeliſts, they were no philoſophers nor ſcholaſtics.

Huſbandmen, or ſhepherds, or men of mechanical callings, were the moſt of the holy writers: David a ſhepherd, Amos a herdſman, the apoſtles fiſhermen, Paul a tent-maker; *unlearned* and *ignorant* men was their general character. Acts iv. 13. Men of learning among the Jews were no ſcholaſtic literati, and the *unlearned* men ſince, who have *wreſted* the ſcriptures, have for the moſt part been profound adepts in other ſciences, but *unlearned* in divinity. It is not intended to reject all ſorts of learning as uſeleſs to the right underſtanding of the ſcriptures. A knowledge of the languages in which they were written, the popular arts they allude to, ancient uſages and cuſtoms, but eſpecially *ſcripturiſm*, are neceſſary. By ſcripturiſm is meant a particular knowledge of the ſcripture idiom, its own ſenſe of words and phraſes; it ever explains itſelf, and needs no labored criticiſm to inveſtigate its ſenſe. That ſuch is the character of the ſcriptures and the writers of them, *holy popular*, appears from the books themſelves. In ſome places they are even ungrammatical, where the conſtruction is not with the words, but ſenſe. II. Cor. viii. 23. Beza owns they ſoliciſe with the vulgar, and are written without the art of logic, by definitions, argumentations, and method, or any flowers of common rhetoric or artificial eloquence. Grotius ſaith, our

Savior's ſpeech was clear and popular in his parables and ſimilitudes. For the moſt part the ſtile of ſcripture is ſimple, unadorned and unaffected, though not without ſome paſſages of great ſublimity. But the eloquence there uſed is inartificial, ſuch as becomes the language of wiſdom, and the ſacred paſſions and affections they abound with. Their eloquence ariſes out of the ſubject treated of, and follows their wiſdom. To conteſt as ſome do for the preeminence of ſcripture in artificial eloquence, to the Greek or Roman philoſophers, is like proving the greatneſs of Alexander, or Cæſar, by alledging they were good fiddlers and dancers. They have but little concern for eternal life, who reject the ſcriptures, becauſe deſtitute of attic eloquence, or purity of greeciſm. They are conciſe and ſimple in their hiſtorical narrations, ſuppreſſing all reflections of their own, where an uninſpired writer would uſe them. If Chriſt in his ſermon on the mount had affected the ſtrains of Demoſthenes or Cicero, it would have lowered the dignity of that excellent diſcourſe. The ſcriptures are well known to uſe many words and phraſes in a ſenſe peculiar to themſelves. As civil law terms muſt be underſtood in a civil law ſenſe, and not in the ſenſe of philoſophy, ſo ſcripture terms muſt be underſtood ſcripturally, and according to the *ſpecific nature* of that inſtitution where they are found. To explain the ſame words in Adam's œconomy, as is done in Chriſt's, though often done, confounds natural and earthly things with ſpiritual and heavenly, the figures and types, with the ſubſtance and antitypes. Adam is ſaid to be a natural man, not ſpiritual, and a figure of him that was to come, even Chriſt: therefore the goods and evils derived or derivable to his deſcendents could only be natural. And this is the caſe when terms belonging to the judaical firſt covenant are interpreted like the ſame terms uſed in the goſpel, better covenant. In the firſt covenant there is no ſpiritual, heavenly promiſe, Heb. ix. 15, but in the ſecond

all is ſpiritual and heavenly. If therefore words in both are interpreted alike, the ſecond is not the better covenant in its promiſes; and if the death without mercy for tranſgreſſing Moſes' law, is ſpiritual and eternal, no *ſorer* puniſhment can be inflicted for neglecting the goſpel. In many places of ſcripture, the language is peculiarly idiomatical, joining plural nouns to ſingular verbs, in greeciſing hebraiſms, and vice verſa. Theſe holy writings are the more beautiful, becauſe like a chaſte matron, they are not trigged off with any gaudy aſcititious ornaments of art. Their ſimilitudes are taken from common life, chiefly from huſbandry, and the practices of popular communities, the government of kingdoms, cities, and families: hence the church hath all theſe names. Some quotations in the new teſtament, from the old, are with a popular unexactneſs in names, numbers, and proverbial ſpeeches, according to the ſenſe, and not the words. Matt. xi. 26. from Micah x. 2. They ſometimes ſpeak of things in the groſs or round numbers, and for brevities ſake interweave diſtinct hiſtorical facts, where the matters were well known to their auditors. Acts vii. 16. Sometimes they ſpeak in the ſenſe of *equivalence*, Prov. xiii. 24. Pſ. xix. 1. or by way of *computation*, Deut. xxiv. 6. or *reputation*, Luke xxiii. 32, &c. The ſcriptures are holy popular in their *end*, and *deſign*, which are not to make men good critics, nor diſputants, but good livers.

3. The ſcriptures are the holy peoples book of *life*.

They are the law and rule of their life, and teach the ſcience of vital ſanctity, or the art of holy living. They are the inſtitutes of life, treat of the living God, or that life which is according to him. In them we have maxims proper to civil, moral, domeſtic, ſpiritual and eternal life. Their private hiſtories are properly biographical. We read of no recluſe perſons, as philoſophers ſhut up in their ſchools, or monks in their cloiſters; but of men of buſineſs and life, who acted in every

department and office, in high and low, civil, military and eccleſiaſtical characters, in private, domeſtic and public life; and who acted both well and ill, in proſperity and adverſity; ſo that every one almoſt, may find in them an example to follow or avoid, whether ruler, ſubject, miniſter, people, huſband, wife, head of a family, &c. The *end* of ſcripture is, that we may *live and not die;* live well here, and happily hereafter. In them are the words, ſtatutes, ordinances, law and miniſtration of life, through the ſpirit which is life. They aim to reſtore and nouriſh the beſt kind of life, the life which is divine, through the prince of life, who laid down his own precious life, to redeem us from death and to reſtore us to life everlaſting.

4. The ſcriptures are the book of *ſocietive* and *politic life*, both *civil religious* and *ſpiritual religious*.

The bible is properly a political book in its treating of things and perſons. Its ethics, economics, eccleſiaſtics, all relate to ſocietive and politic life: every man is conſidered as ſtanding in ſome ſocietive politic relation. The ſtate and character of God himſelf is ſuch: no farther than he is king is he God, and we are his *ſubjects* as really and truly as we are creatures, or men. To him two eminent titles belong as definitive and characteriſtical, "king of nations" and "king of ſaints;" Jer. x. 7. Rev. xv. 3. and from theſe all civil religious and ſpiritual religious obligations are derived. The attributes of God are not only vital and perſonal, but *royal* and *imperial*. It is in his royal and imperial character that the deity is the object of religious homage and worſhip. The ſcholaſtic mode of contemplating him as a ſpirit, a pure mind, moſt perfect intelligence, or eſſence, the greateſt, beſt, and wiſeſt of beings is unſcriptural, and leaves room to aſk, "who is Lord over us?" In the ſcriptures we have the beſt foundation of civil religious policy. Government is there declared to be an ordinance of God as king of nations, the end and deſign of it is

pointed out, the civil moral rights and dues of God and of man, are aſcertained and declared, and all power is of God in every mode of its lawful poſſeſſion or conveyance. There the qualifications and duties of rulers are ſpecified, the privileges and meaſures of obedience in ſubjects are alſo declared.

And as nations only exiſt in this world, the ſcriptures teach us that God hath inſtituted a religion of this world even his moral law, as of *civil religious* interpretation, for both rulers and ſubjects in their places to obſerve, in order to the exaltation of a nation.

In the ſame divine book we have a complete ſyſtem of *ſpiritual religious politics*. God, as *king of ſaints*, is founder of a kingdom, and inſtitutor of *a religion not of this world*, deſcribing the ſubjects, the terms and mode of induction, &c. However obvious this character of the ſcriptures is, it hath been moſt unaccountably overlooked by ſcholaſtic divines. In their ſyſtems there is no deſcription of God as king, nor of his kingdom, and if a politic term comes in their way, they call it a figure, or metaphorical expreſſion, and thruſt it out of ſight. The aſſembly's catechiſm in its anſwer to "What is God?" doth not expreſs the ſtate and ſovereignty of God, and its firſt title "God is a ſpirit," on which all the reſt is predicated, is not ſcripture. The text referred to in the original is *God is ſpirit*, expreſſing his ſpecific nature and character, and not his immateriality, which diſtinguiſhes him not from evil beings. The rights of God are all rights of ſovereignty, and all our dues to him infer the ſtate of ſubjects. The bible is a ſealed book to ſuch as treat things metaphyſically. The religious politics of ſcripture are of two ſorts; firſt, *civil*, directing our conduct as nations, rulers, ſubjects parents, children, huſbands, wives, maſters and ſervants, all politic relations. formed by civil moral ties, and which continue only in *this life*; ſecond, *ſpiritual*, directing our conduct as ſaints and

fellow citizens of heaven. To explain such a book philosophically and scholastically, is as absurd as it would be to explain the law of a common wealth by the Elements of Euclid, or Sir Isaac Newton's optics. Divines who interpret scripture metaphysically, act no better a part than a physician would act who blowed up bubbles, and looked at them with glasses, to cure the fever or gout.

5. The scriptures contain the word of God, expressing his mind upon the various subjects they treat, in language accommodated to the capacity of holy people.

The word of God is their common title, and God is said to speak in them, to declare his mind about the various matters of which they treat, not in language which man's wisdom, but the Holy Ghost, teacheth. They by whom the contents of scripture were first *spoken* were God's *mouth*, and they by whom these *speeches* were first *written* were God's *scribe's* or *amanuenses*. The scriptures are therefore their own best interpreters, and need not the inventions, nor traditions, nor vain conceits of men, to help to understand them. Yet the truth of fact is, that they have met with worse treatment, from learned scholastics, but unlearned in scripturism, than the Jew did who fell among thieves. Unskilful and unholy bunglers, have wrested them to their own and others hurt.

Christ directs us to *search* the scriptures: and the Bereans are commended for thus doing. By the *searching* recommended, is not intended a cursory reading, but a diligent and careful perusal of them with attentive minds, good and honest hearts, free, independent, and unbiassed by preconceived notions, minds open to conviction and the light of truth, unfettered by human authority in popes fathers, councils, creeds, catechisms and confessions, even though to give a sanction and currency to their dogmas, they are stamped with the sanctimonious name of *orthodoxy*.

A mind under the ſhackles of tradition and human pretended authority, or as Dr. Watt's expreſſes it, a *ſoul in fetters*, can never arrive to the knowledge of the truth; and if that ſhould arrive to him, he will not dare to entertain or profeſs it, becauſe others through ſloth, bigotry and ſuperſtition have no love of light, but want his company in darkneſs. The utmoſt diligence is neceſſary in the ſearch of ſcripture, as the truths belonging to the ſcience of ſanctity are interſperſed and mingled with other matters, in part with deſign to exerciſe our induſtry, and that the truth too eaſily come by, may not be deſpiſed. If the character and deſign of ſcripture is kept in view, and we attend to the connection and ſcope of the ſacred writers, conſider the ſeveral inſtitutions of religion, where words are found; and above all, if we look to him that indicted them to lead us into the knowledge of them; we ſhall know of the doctrine they contain. In this way an attempt ſhall be made to explain the chriſtian theory.

## CHAP. IV.

### OF GOD THE FATHER.

*Of the one God as the* Father: *a ſingular intellectualiſt: how a and the Father: foundation of his paternity, &c.*

IN the ſecond chapter God was conſidered as the efficient of the firſt creation, and the founder of his original kingdom; as well as the author of the Moſaic terreſtrial animal ſyſtem: he is now to be contemplated under a new character as a Redeemer, new Creator and Savior; and eſpecially as the God and Father of a diſtinguiſhed perſon called his Son, as related to another perſon called the Holy Ghoſt; which three are the perſonal ſovereignty of the kingdom of God as it is now con-

ſtituted. This will lead us to an explanation of the doctrine of the trinity ſo called. In this part of the theory we ſhall have to combat with deep rooted prejudices, and tradionary dogmas which have been received with profound veneration. All that is deſired of the reader is to uſe his *own faculties*, to think of his *own intereſt* in knowing the truth ; and not to like his religion the *leſs* for underſtanding it.

The fundamental article of all religion is that there is a God, and that He is but *one*, and of *none*, abſolutely ſupreme and independent ; the *higheſt*, or *moſt high*. Reaſon and revelation teach this doctrine ; and any doctrine of a trinity, ſubverſive of this monotheiſm is certainly wrong. For three ſupremes, or higheſts, or three ſupreme coordinate perſons in one being or God, three equals in power and glory, or a triune Jehovah, are repugnances to reaſon, ſcripture, and the common ſenſe of mankind, where they exerciſe it. A three-one king, a three-one divine majeſty, a three unit, and a three individual, are equally true ; or rather untrue. No ſpecific or even numerical ſameneſs of eſſence or nature, in the three perſons, conſtitute them one God or Being ; becauſe eſſence or nature is no intellect, without which perſonality cannot be conſtituted as joined with a nature : and a three-one intellect, or intelligence, is the ſame with a three individual. There was ſhewn to Iſrael but one perſonal Jehovah, beſides whom there is no other in the ſupreme underived ſenſe. Deut. iv. 35. and vi. 4. vii. 9. And the ſame is affirmed in many other parts of ſcripture : Pſ. lxxxvi. 6. Mark xii. 29, 32. I. Cor. viii. 4. Gal. iii. 20. I. Tim. ii. 5. The exiſtence of ever ſo many perſons in one nature, doth not make them one being, or perſonal agent ; nor are there as many perſonalities as there are natures in a being. All men exiſt in one human nature and are perſonally diſtinguiſhed by their intellects : and all holy beings exiſt in one ſpecific divine nature or eſſence, but certainly they are not all one being compounded.

The one God is no compounded being, conſiſting of two other perſons beſides himſelf: for He is "the only true God," as diſtinguiſhed from "him whom he hath ſent," "the one Lord, and from the one and ſame Spirit." John xvii. 3. I. Cor. viii. 4. To the Father belongs alſo certain perſonal attributes, incompatible to the Son, and Holy Ghoſt under any denomination. He is not God by reaſon of his Son or Spirit, but they are divine by reaſon of their relation to Him. Never are the three perſons in conjunction called one God. The Father is *eis* one, expreſſive of a perſonal unity: but the three are *to en*, denoting another kind of unity, in which others are comprehended. John xvii. 21. The ſecond perſon hath no exiſtence but as a Son, and in his higheſt ſtate of dignity hath a God as well as Father, and therefore cannot be one God, with his own God, whoſe ſon he is. Heb. i. 9. A miſtake prevails that Jeſus is a ſon only as man, and the ſon of man as born of a woman; but neither of theſe are true. He is the Son of God as born of a woman, a virgin, and hath no other filiation, and is the ſon of man upon another account, as will be ſhewn. As the Son of God born of a woman, neither man nor the will of man had any kind of concurrence or efficiency in his production, but are totally and abſolutely excluded in that his virgin mother "knew not a man." The Holy Ghoſt is the ſpirit of God, and cannot therefore be the ſame God with him whoſe ſpirit he is ſaid to be.

This one God whoſe ſupremacy and underived honor ſcholaſtics have ſhamefully, and needleſsly attacked for the defence of the Son's divinity, is ſtiled the "Father, of whom are all things." I. Cor. viii. 5. As ſuch he ſtands oppoſed to the gods many, and diſtinguiſhed from the Son, "the one Lord by whom are all things." If the Son or Jeſus Chriſt is included in the Father as the one God, He is the Father of himſelf, which in effect deſtroys his perſonal being, as the Sabellians do, ſaying

that the *Higheſt* of whom John was the prophet, is the Son, Jeſus Chriſt, Luke i. 76. when this ſame perſon is called the *Son of the Higheſt*, Luke i. 32. which makes him to be the Son of himſelf.

The reputed orthodox are not put out with the abſurdity of two or three ſupremes, higheſts, firſts, and equals in government. But no language could be deviſed plainer than that which the ſcripture makes uſe of to declare that there is but one God, and that the individual perſon of the Father is *He*. And yet ſcholaſtics will have the one God to conſiſt of three perſons, which is no better than ſaying one intellectualiſt is three intellectualiſts, that is one perſon is three perſons. One God or being can have but one intellect, and a perſon cannot have leſs than one. The ſcholaſtic, a monk in France who formed the creed called after Athonaſius, ſaith, "The Father is Almighty, the Son is Almighty, and the Holy Ghoſt is Almighty, and yet they are not three Almighties, but one Almighty. Mighty edifying to common people, and pleaſing to infidels: and to crown the abſurdity an anathema is ſubjoined againſt all who do not thus believe it, a national church of great celebrity have adopted it, obliged their clergy to ſubſcribe it; and learned expoſitions have been written upon that and their thirty nine articles, to ſhew how they may be underſtood, and ſubſcribed in another ſenſe than that of the compilers, and yet be ſincere. See Biſhop Burnet, &c. Let not ſuch complain of tranſubſtantiation, or Jeſuitical prevarication: clear ſolid darkneſs, unadulterated with light, is the object of their love.

Every perſon is a diſtinct intellectualiſt, having an individual vital ſubſtance or eſſence. And as one being can be no more than one diſtinct intelligent perſonal agent; it is plain that three perſons each of which cannot be leſs than one diſtinct intelligent perſonal agent, cannot be one compound diſtinct intelli-

gent perſonal agent, any more than three ſingle units can be one compound unit. The diſtinction of what is *above* reaſon, and of what is *contrary* to it, is futile. The fact is denied that theſe three perſons are ever in ſcripture ſaid to be one God, nor is there any thing there aſſerted concerning them which implies any ſuch thing; nothing in ſcripture above reaſon or contrary to reaſon is any object of faith; for then we ſhould believe without reaſon and repugnant to it, which none are ever required to do. Now as the one God is only one individual perſonal agent, of one underſtanding and will: it muſt be abſurd to ſuppoſe a three-one underſtanding, and a three-one will.

This one God, is the God and father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as much the one as the other, and in his whole perſon, Eph. i. 3, 17. for the perſon of Jeſus being conſtituted by his generation and nativity at Bethlehem, God was his alone father, and there was no agency of man to the production of that Holy Thing in any ſhape whatever. It cannot be true therefore that the firſt perſon in the Trinity, is the God and Father to the ſecond, only in the loweſt capacity. The ſecond perſon hath no exiſtence but as a Son, and ſuſtains no title that will not bear that addition. Always where the name God is uſed in the abſolute ſenſe, and creation is aſcribed to him in the primary ſenſe, the one God the Father is intended. Job xxxi. 15. Mal. ii. 10. Acts iv. 24. That the terms God and Father are ſometimes to be underſtood *eſſentially*, for the whole Trinity in one Being, and at other times *perſonally*, for the firſt perſon in the Trinity, is a dogma of ſcholaſtics, like a thouſand others, without truth, and repugnant to reaſon and common ſenſe. For every *real* God and Father is *eſſentially* ſuch, and a compound God and Father is ſimple uncompounded nonſenſe. Scholaſtics have been led into error, by conſidering *eſſence or nature*, as of the ſame import with perſonal being,

and ſo ſynonymous; but they might conſider an integer and cypher as the ſame, for eſſence or nature are no being, but only the property of being: and how many ſoever diſtinguiſhing properties one being may have, he cannot have more or leſs than one intellect and perſonality. A ſingular perſon may have ſeveral eſſences or natures; man may have three, *animal in fleſh and blood*, whereby he is a beaſt; Eccl. iii. 18, 19, 20. *human* in *rationality*: and *divine* as born of God. Neither of theſe natures or eſſences hath any exiſtence or agency ſeparate from that intellect which exiſts in them. As there muſt be one intellect to one being, and no more, ſo there muſt be no leſs, to one perſon. Three or two intellects united in one, is abſurd; and ſo is two perſonalities or intelligencies, in one compound perſon or intelligence.

"We, the orthodox, (ſaith one for the reſt) aſſert that as there is but one true God, ſo in him, there are a plurality of perſons, and theſe perſons are three, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt." Again, "To form a right notion of the true God, we muſt ſet Him before us as a moſt bleſſed eſſence conſiſting of three perſons." Theolo. Reform. p. 7. vol. I. This is, *we orthodoxy in every ſenſe*, that which Sir Richard Steele, in the Guardian, ſpeaks of, nonſenſe to the underſtanding and nonſence to the conſcience. Two or three uncauſed independent perſons, cannot be admitted any more than two or three thouſand. And two or three ſuch in one being, is ſtill more unaccountable. But to get over this abſurdity, it is ſaid, "That the mode of the exiſtence of the Divine Being may well be ſuppoſed to be different from that of all other beings." This is an example of what is *above reaſon*, or *without reaſon*. The Divine Being is ſtill a being, and exiſtence in him is ſtill exiſtence; and that there ſhould be any *mode* of exiſtence in Him *above* reaſon, is *beyond* their knowledge; and it is repugnant to reaſon that a ſingle Being ſhould be a three Being at

the ſame time, in the ſame ſenſe, or any ſenſe whatever. The firſt doctrine the "We orthodox," ought to be concerned for, even before that of the divinity of the Son, is that of the monotheiſm of the Father: for the Son hath no being or divinity but as the only begotten of the only true God the Father; and there is no Trinity where the Father is not the *firſt* and the *fountain*. The ſingular preeminence of the Father as the one God in the ſupreme ſenſe, and a vindication of his incommunicable, underived and independent honors, are neceſſary in order that he may be glorified as God, and the charge of having more gods than one may be avoided. The Son and Holy Ghoſt have all this *divinity of nature by reaſon* of their peculiar relation to the one God: whereas He hath his divinity of none. However intimate and eſſential their union may be, the Father alone is the one God in the ſupreme ſenſe, with one ſingular underſtanding, mind, and will: but the Son hath a mind and will diſtinct from the Father; and ſo alſo hath the Holy Ghoſt; Matt. xvi. 36. I. Cor. xiii. 2. and whatever agreement there may be between theſe three wills, they cannot be one ſingular identical will. The Jews, neither inſpired nor uninſpired, ever thought of deducing a Trinity from any idiomatical expreſſions in their language, where a ſingular and plural are united, as in Jehovah Elohim, to denote the ſame perſon, or the plural noun *us* is connected with a ſingular verb. And it is probable they knew their own language as well as any do now. If it is ſaid Elohim muſt ſignify *two* or *three*, why not more? Moſes was an Elohim to Pharaoh. And if God ſaid, let *us* make man in *our* image, ſo it is ſaid, He is renewed after the image of *Him* that created him. Reaſon and common ſenſe, when exerciſed, conceive of God as exiſting prior to any relation, whether of Father or Creator. As God He exiſts by neceſſity of nature; but generation and creation are not neceſſary, but voluntary, and cannot, a parte ante, be eternal. God would not have

been leſs *eſſentially God*, if no creation or generation had taken place: for what is from *His good pleaſure*, and *His love*, can be no neceſſary and involuntary *emanations* from Him. There are therefore certain prerogatives and rights which belong to the Father as the one God. "And it can be no diminution of the Son, that He is from another, for his very name of a Son implies it: but it would be derogatory to the Father to ſpeak thus of Him. There muſt be ſome preeminence where there is room for derogation. What God the Father is, He is from none; but what the Son is, He is from the Father: the Father is not God by reaſon of his Son, but the Son is God by reaſon of the Father. In the very name Father, there is ſomething of preeminence, which is not in that of Son: and ſome priority muſt be aſcribed to Him whom we rightly call the firſt, in reſpect of Him whom we call the ſecond perſon: and this priority we ought to endeavor to preſerve, leſt we deny the glory, which is evidently due to the Father as the one only God." See Pearſon on the Creed. Jeſus calls the Father his God, aſcribes all he hath to Him, confeſſes he was of Him, and ſent by Him, and expreſsly ſaith, "The Father is greater than I." John xiv. 28. For the Father to ſay theſe things of the Son in any ſenſe would be incongruous: And to ſay this priority of the Father to the Son, reſpects only a part, and not the whole of the perſon of the latter, only as to one of his natures, and not the other, hath no truth, ſenſe, or meaning in it. It is a *perſonal* priority of a Divine Father to a Divine Son. Their natures may be the ſame, and yet the genitor be greater than the begotten, the giver than the receiver, the ſender than the ſent. Greatneſs is not predicable of a nature abſtracted from the intellect that exiſts in it, nor is a nature capable of any miſſion, for it is no agent, but the conſtituitive property of a perſonal being. The Father is therefore ſo the one God, that whatever of being, or divinity of ſtate, or of nature, the Son hath, it is by way of

communication or derivation from the Father, as its *fountain*. The Son, who beſt knew the Father and himſelf, acknowledges he is from the Father, lives by Him, and in Him, and that He *gave* him to have life in himſelf. The Son alſo refers all to the Father, as he received all from him. To make the Son ſelf exiſtent, independent of the Father, the Higheſt, or ſupreme God under a ſecond nation, and equal in eſſential authority and divinity, ſubverts the monarchy and unity of the great God of the univerſe, and gives great offence to ſcripture trinitarians; and alſo ſcandal to thoſe without, which ought to be removed, as it may conſiſtently, and will be done when reaſon and ſcripture recover their place.

The one perſonal God ſuſtains the title and relation of *a* Father, and *the* Father.

In every nation the Deity hath been conſidered as a Father, even though the whole foundation of his paternity was not known; and alſo the prieſts and miniſters of the Deity, both among pagans and chriſtians, have had the ſame name. This title is in ſcripture given to God upon ſeveral accounts. Generation is the proper foundation of it; but generation is applied to ſeveral modes of production, as that of creation, Gen. ii. 4. and the firſt book in the bible hath its name from hence. God as creator is called the Father of heaven and earth; the Father of the rains; of vital beings; of ſpirits; Heb. xii. 9. of the animal Adam; Luke iii. 38. and of all men; Mal. ii. 10. Preſervation is a paternal act. He is alſo the Father (helper) of the fatherleſs: Redemption is a kind of new creation, and gives another ground of paternity. Deut. xxx. 6. Exo. iv. 22. God is a Father to confirmed angels and regenerate chriſtians. Eph. iii. 15. In regeneration there is a father begetting, children born of incorruptible ſeed, and the divine nature communicated; the church is a mother to the new born in and of her. Gal. iv. 26. Pſ. lxxxvii. 5.

The regeneration into the life of glory conſtitutes God the Father of glory to his children. The reſurrection of our bodies is a nativity into another life, and the ſaints are the ſons of God, being ſons of the reſurrection, and are begotten again into a new mode of being. The laws have invented a way by which a perſon may become a father not by *procreation* but *adoption*; chriſtians are God's adoptive children. And God is a Father to all rulers, and they are his ſons and children in their ſtate. Pſ. lxxxii. 6.

But the one God is *the Father*, in a proper appropriate ſenſe, of one individual perſon called his *own*, his *only*, and *only begotten* Son, in a ſingular, ſupernatural and divine manner. This Son is joined with the Father in the form of baptiſm, in the apoſtolic benediction, and in ſome doxologies. This Son never ſaith *our Father*, as joining himſelf with others, but *my Father*, as ſingularly his *own*; and yet there are many whom he is not aſhamed to call brethren, and rank as the firſt born among them. He ſaith to his diſciples, I aſcend to the *own* Father of me, and to the Father of you. John xx. 17. original. He is called the only begotten of the Father, as Iſaac is of Abraham, though both have other ſons in a leſs eminent ſenſe. The title of God, as *the* Father, is neither by creation nor adoption. As the firſt perſon in the Trinity ſuſtains no higher title than that of Father, ſo the ſecond hath no higher title than that of Son. The firſt perſon in the Trinity, is the Father of the *whole* perſon of the ſecond perſon in the Trinity. And the preeminence of the firſt perſon in the Trinity conſiſts in his being the *God as well as Father*, of the Son, Eph. i. 3, 7. Matt. xxvi. 46. who is expreſsly ſaid to have a God even where he is called God himſelf. Heb. i. 8, 9. A Son cannot be *auto theos*, God of himſelf. If the Genitor be a God, he muſt be a God to the generated Son.

God is the Father of Jeſus Chriſt upon *two accounts*, and as the foundation of his paternity in theſe reſpects is different, ſo the

relation of both did not commence at the ſame time. Jeſus was *born* the Son of God by *nature*, as Chriſt he was *made* the Son of God by *office*. John x. 36. The not diſtinguiſhing theſe two cauſes of the divine paternity, the one *natural*, and the other *political*, hath occaſioned much confuſion and darkneſs in the minds of divines. And many have overlooked the only natural ground of paternity in the Father to the Son, and have ſubſtituted one in its place that never did exiſt, and according to the known analogy of things, never could exiſt, even that of an *eternal generation of an eternal Son*. Nothing of this is expreſſed or even implied in all the bible, and yet the acknowledgment of *an eternal Son of an eternal Father*, hath been for a long time the great *Shibboleth of ſcholaſtic orthodoxy*, and many a worthy perſon hath ſuffered more deaths than one, becauſe he was not jeſuit enough to believe it with his *will*, when he could not believe it with his *underſtanding*, as the artful ſons of Loyola direct in the matter of tranſubſtantiation. Here the wiſdom of this world hath operated moſt energetically in philoſophy and ſcholaſticiſm.

We are told that with reſpect to this Son, the Deity was "always Father as he was always God;" thus the cauſe and effect are coeternal, and to compleat the abſurdity, this ſecond perſon begotten and born before all worlds, without a mother, *condeſcended* to be born in time, the Son of man without a human father. The eternal Son which is one *ſelf*, takes to himſelf "a true body and a reaſonable ſoul," which is another perſon, but after the union they are "two natures and one perſon forever;" and yet there is no converſion of one nature into the other, confuſion or commixion of both in one. And by virtue of a communion of properties, things are predicated of the whole perſon, which belong to one nature only, even before the union of the natures took place, which conſtitute the perſon. Dr. Edwards in the matter of creation argues,

"That the cauſe ever precedes the effect; and that therefore an eternal cauſe of an eternal effect, a parte ante, is abſurd: for it is impoſſible what had its being from another, ſhould be co-exiſtent with it." This will hold true in any kind of production. God therefore is not "a moſt perfect eſſence conſiſting of three perſons" as Dr. Edwards ſuppoſes, but the perſonal Father only, of his only begotten Son.

## CHAP. V.

### OF THE SON OF GOD.

*Of the divine imperial Son of God, in his perſonal conſtitution and origination, by his Bethlehemetical generation, conception, and nativity; which was not humiliating, but honorary: His natures divine and human, and dignity thereby: His progreſs towards perfection, and the completion of his generative capacity as God with God in the beginning of the goſpel epoch or æra.*

THIS illuſtrious perſonage, the only begotten, and divinely noble Son of God, began his perſonal being in our world, by a proper generation, conception, and nativity at Bethlehem, as really and truly as John, called the Baptiſt, did ſix months before; nor is there any account of the prior exiſtence and acts of the one, any more than of the other. Two Evangeliſts, Matthew and Luke, begin ſo early, as to give an account of their perſonal origination; while Mark and John begin their hiſtory with John Baptiſt's Miniſtry; which is the goſpel epoch; in the beginning of which, Jeſus as the word was with God, and was God, which was alſo at the termination of his generative capacity, when Chriſt Jeſus ſubſiſted in the form of God. Philip. ii. 6, 7.

The two firſt mentioned hiſtorians are now to be attended to, and they give a very plain and particular account of the generation, conception, and noble birth of Jeſus, the Son of God and of David, in the *preparatory* ſteps towards it, the *perſons* acting therein, from whence we may fairly infer the *natures*, *dignity* and *ſtate* of the Holy Thing born, through the whole of his generative, and until his official capacity commenced. Tradition ought to have no place here: revelation is our only rule as judged of by reaſon common ſenſe, and the analogy of things.

1. As to the generation, conception, and nativity itſelf, the *firſt* obſervation is, that the whole narration is to be underſtood *literally*, in oppoſition to what is *figurative*, and *metaphorical*; and that there was a real, proper generation, conception and nativity: There is a literal ſenſe of words as applied to ſpiritual and divine things, as well as to natural things: and there may be as true, proper, ſpiritual, and divine generation, conception and nativity, in all eſſentialities, as there can be in what is natural and human. Generation differs from creation in both the *modus* and *product*. In the mode it is *interior* from the life and eſſence of the genitor. Creation is a mode of production by way of *external efficiency*. In generation the *product* is always of the ſame ſpecies with the begetter, nor can it be otherwiſe in nature or grace: but in creation the *product* is always a creature. Every derived being according to the ſcholaſtic definition, is not a creature; a divine genitor muſt communicate divine and eternal life to the begotten, though no ſon can be eternal a parte ante. If we know not the way of the ſpirit, or how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child: Eccl. xi. 5. yet there are certain eſſentialities requiſite to every proper generation, conception, and nativity, and if any of theſe are wanting, no ſuch thing can be.

2. The generation we are now treating of, was neither common, natural, carnal, nor of the will of man, but ſupernatural, ſpiritual, and divine. Jeſus was not born of *bloods*, or of the *will of the fleſh*, or of *the will of man, but of God*, ſince his many brethren among whom he is the firſt born, were not ſo born. John i. 13. If coagulated bloods is the natural fœtus formed in the womb, "all men are made of one *blood*." Natural fleſh and blood are in their own nature corruptible. Acts xvii. 26. I. Cor. xv. 50. Blood is the life of animals, and therefore prohibited to be eaten. Gen. ix. 4. Acts xv. 20. Natural fleſh and blood are not the proper human nature, but animal parts of men as the ſons of the animal Adam; they diſtinguiſh not men from beaſts, or give them any preeminence above beaſts. This is the preſent eſtate of the ſons of men, that God might manifeſt them. Eccl. iii. 18, 19, 20, 21. Men in their ſpirits are God's offspring and children, and not in fleſh and blood, born of the fathers of their fleſh, according to the benediction given to Adam and Eve in conjunction, "increaſe and multiply." Now what is contended for is that the *Holy Thing* was not born a beaſt according to the preſent common eſtate of the ſons of men. He was not of the firſt Adam, of the earth earthy, the Virgin knew not a man, the product of that nativity was not man, or the ſon of man, but the Son of God born of a woman. Gal. iv. 4.

The ſon of God's nativity was therefore not natural, I. Cor. xv. 46. but ſpiritual. The proper humanity in a true body and reaſonable ſoul he was poſſeſſed of: but was free from the animal appendages, and natural evils men are ſubjected to, by their deſcent from the firſt Adam in the courſe of nature, ſuch as mortality, corruptibility, &c. Diſtinctive humanity of nature in a true body, doth exiſt ſeparate from animal fleſh and blood in Chriſt ſince his reſurrection, and were conſtituitive of his perſon in conjunction of the divine nature, at his birth.

Much leſs was Jeſus born of the will of the fleſh, ſo as to be *fleſh*, of fleſh, John i. 13. John iii. 6. but *ſpirit* born of the ſpirit. Fleſh the product of fleſh is *ſinful*, the teeming ſource of concupiſcence and carnal affections, and is a vital nature, in which there is no ſpiritually good thing. But the Holy thing was perfectly pure, and entirely free from the *body of the ſins of the fleſh*, and the *body of ſin and death*, derived to the ſons of men from their natural head.

Neither was he *born of the will of man*.

The Virgin excludes all concurrence of man, "how ſhall this thing be ſeeing I know not a man?" and the angel in his reply acknowledges as much, "with God nothing ſhall be impoſſible." Luke i. 34, 37. Jeſus was no ben Adam, ſon of Adam, but of God. Nothing which men are the cauſes or authors of, was then born, in name or nature. But this was ſpiritual, holy, and divine. Though He is called the "fruit of her womb," yet he was the ſeed of the woman, and not of man. She was found *with child of the Holy Ghoſt*, when eſpouſed to Joſeph, *before they came together*, Matt. i. 18. Luke i. 35. in conſequence of the Holy Ghoſt's coming upon her. But the Holy Ghoſt was not the Father of Jeſus any more than He is the Father of the regenerate who are born of the ſpirit. The product was *ſpirit*, which is divinity or vital ſanctity. He was a *ſaint of God-kind* of ſon, ſubſtantial divinity and eternal life, conſtituted the life or vital nature of that Holy Thing; and the power of the Higheſt's overſhadowing the Virgin was the *cauſe* of his filiation to God. No creative agency was now employed: God of his own holy virtuous will, begat his only Son, who was born not of corruptible, but incorruptible ſeed. He was *Deus genitus et natus*, God begotten and born. A divine father cannot beget a creature ſon, or communicate any other but his own divine, and eternal life. We need no other proof of the Son's divinity of

nature, than that *he was the own proper Son of a divine Father*. Generation is not only the communication of what hath life, but the *ſame* life with that of the genitor, which by being imparted becomes life in *himſelf* to the generated, his own conſtituitive vital nature. "As the father hath life in himſelf, ſo He hath given to the Son to have life in himſelf." If the Father's life is eternal, ſo muſt the Son's be from henceforth: but it is impoſſible a ſon ſhould be eternal a parte ante, as alſo that *given* life ſhould be ſelf originate. We never read of any eternal Son's now *condeſcending* to be born, or coming from heaven to enter the virgin's womb, or being any ways *active* in this affair. The birth of Jeſus is always expreſſed in the paſſive voice: nor have we one witneſs that an eternal Logos now took to himſelf a true body and a reaſonable ſoul, or aſſumed the human nature, as ſome ſpeak, from groundleſs tradition. An "eternal Logos or Son, is one perſon," and one ſelf, and "a true body and a reaſonable ſoul" is another perſon, and another ſelf; and that the firſt of theſe, ſhould take the ſecond into union with itſelf, and then that the two compounded ſelves ſhould be "two natures and but one perſon forever," is clear ſcholaſticiſm, and abſurdity, which Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus ought to be aſhamed of. Fifty natures ſeparate from an intellect do not make a perſon, and one intellect may exiſt in ſeveral natures, and yet all be one intelligent agent only. The ſpirit of man may exiſt in the human nature, in an animal nature, and in the divine nature, and be but one perſon. The ſoul of Jeſus came to exiſt in the human and divine nature at his generation, conception and birth, but all conſtituted but one perſon, and neither nature was active in taking the other, nor the whole perſon in conſtituting itſelf. In the generation of Jeſus the divine life was ſo imparted to the Son, as not to be totally ſeparated from the Father's life, as it is in creature generations, but is like to a

*living ſtream from a living fountain,* an *undivided derivative,* exiſting in each other, and yet having diſtinct ſubſiſtence, by their perſonal intellects of which it is the vital ſubſtance, and not a mere modality or denomination. The Father and Son are not mere relative properties, or denominations of a common eſſence, as Sabellius and others ſuppoſe, for theſe cannot generate or be generated but in their ſubjects.

3. The generation and nativity of the Holy Thing at Bethlehem, was the origin of the perſonal ſubſiſtence, of the Son of God, and of David.

What thoughts ſoever any may have of the prior exiſtence of the intellect of Jeſus to this generation, yet the Son of God had no pre-exiſtent perſonal being, nor are any ſuppoſed acts of that pre-exiſtent ſoul, the acts of the Holy Thing now born. Jeſus became the only begotten of the Father by this generation and nativity, as much as John did, by his nativity of Zechariah and Elizabeth, become their ſon. The one and the other were foreordained, but that precludes actual being. I. Peter i. 20. The divine nature though eternal in itſelf, formed no diſtinct perſonal ſubſiſtence in a Son till now, it was not life given to be in himſelf, before this. Much hath been written by jews and chriſtians of the pre-exiſtent ſoul of the Meſſiah, as the firſt of God's creation, and as the only ſpirit of the human order which ſtood, when devils and others fell. And Dr. Watts and Price, &c. have treated largely of it, and ſuppoſe the many appearances in the Old Teſtament are to be underſtood of it. But theſe are not ſaid to be of Chriſt, nor is God ſaid to have ſpoken till in theſe laſt times by his Son; Heb. i. 2. in the Old Teſtament times the word was ſpoken by angels, but the great ſalvation firſt began to be ſpoken by the Lord Jeſus in his public miniſtry; but the ſuppoſition of his giving the law totally deſtroys the apoſtle's argument. Heb. ii. 1, 2, 3. No other only begotten Son of

God is mentioned in the bible beſides Jeſus, and no other cauſe of his filiation by nature to God, but his Bethlehemetical generation and nativity. And if this pre-exiſtent ſoul did exiſt, and was an agent, his prior acts were not the acts of Jeſus or of Chriſt; nor will any, what ſome call a communion or communication of properties, juſtify the predicating of the whole, what belongs to a part of his perſon, becauſe there was no communion or communication of properties, prior to the union of the natures to which they belong, and neither nature, nor both in conjunction, is a diſtinct agent, but only that intellectualiſt, which exiſts in theſe natures, and of whom they are the vital ſubſtance. To call an *acorn*, the *oak* it may grow into, or the *pillar* it may be in an edifice, is improper.

The Holy Thing, after called Jeſus, and the only begotten Son of God, are one and the ſame perſon, which was not conſtituted until this generation and nativity took place, and no Son of God before exiſted, any more than the *rib* out of which the woman was builded, was the diſtinct perſon of Eve while it remained in Adam, and his acts were predicable of her.

4. This generation, conception, and nativity of the Holy Thing, was no more the act of Jeſus, than theſe ſame acts, are the acts of any other child.

The above is oppoſed to the abſurd language of ſome, that God's Son *condeſcended to be born*, *i. e.* acted to be paſſive: that the eternal Son took to himſelf a true body and a reaſonable ſoul in the virgin's womb: that the eternal God became a mortal man, and more ſuch ſtuff. He was *born*, not *made* of a woman, and his birth and coming into the world, are diſtinguiſhed, as paſſive and active. Luke i. 35. John xviii. 37. Gal. iv. 4. original. How a child ſhould be an agent in his own generation and conception, when his perſonal being was conſtituted, we leave to profound ſcholaſtics to explain. They who deny that the Son of God came from

heaven in his public miniſtry, for want of witneſſes, when it ſhall be proved that Jeſus and the two Johns aſſert it, ought to bring one witneſs or one text, that the Son of God now came from heaven, and entered the virgin's womb, and formed what they call the hypoſtatical union.

5. This generation, conception and nativity, was of that which is creature-tranſcendent, and ſubject-tranſcendent.

Compound words are here uſed becauſe no other will expreſs the idea. A creature may in part be divine by a participation of the divine nature, and a ſubject may have rule over fellow ſubjects, and even ſuperiors to himſelf in ſome reſpects. The divine eſſence, nature, or life, for theſe are the ſame, is but one in God and in all holy beings, who partake of it derivatively from Him. They are with God and Chriſt, even as He and the Father are one, the ſanctifier and the ſanctified are all of one. John xvii. 22. Heb. ii. 2. There is no ſpecific difference, nor eſſential difference, if eſſence, life, and nature, are the ſame. We affirm farther that all ſpirits as ſpirits are of one nature, phyſically conſidered, with only a *gradual* difference. But neither ſaints nor ſpirits are creature-tranſcendent. Creatures may exiſt, without rational ſpirits; and ſpirits may exiſt without the divine nature, as we ſee in devils and the unregenerate: the divine nature is not conſtituitive of the whole of their perſonal being.

Now as to Jeſus, we ſuppoſe his ſpirit which iſſued from the father of ſpirits in a way, time, and manner, to us unknown, was the firſt of all ſpirits, and as to ſanctity or divinity of nature, the Holy Jeſus never did, and cannot exiſt without it. This creature-tranſcendency is involved in that appropriate title, THE ONLY BEGOTTEN SON OF GOD.

Conſidering Saints as regenerate he is the firſt born among many brethren, as one of *their ſpecies*, *a ſaint of God kind of ſon*, they are *re born* of the ſame Spirit he was *born*. He is the

Father of eternal life to them, and they are his ſeed he was to ſee as the fruit of the travail of his ſoul, and the children he will preſent to the Father. Iſa. ix. 6. liii. 10. Heb. ii. 13. But as *the only begotten*, he hath a natural preeminence to Creatures; He is not of their party; and hath no compeer among angels or human ſaints, to none of whom did God ever ſay, "thou art *my ſon*, this day have I begotten thee." The holy King was *ſuperior* to angels, not *lower*, when he was born, and lay in the manger.

Again, this is the generation of what was *ſubject-tranſcendent, divinely royal and imperial.*

God as a king, the divine majeſty, the higheſt, or moſt high, begat his imperial ſon and heir. He was born the divine ſon the King, not of the ſubject party in God's kingdom, any more than he was of the creature party in God's creation.

By his virgin mother he is of the royal family of David. In the prophets he is called the "branch of Jehovah," and "the righteous Branch of David." The branch muſt be like its root. He was a ſtem of ancient royalty, of the royal family of Judah who derived his pedigree from ancient kings; This is the meaning of his "goings forth being of old, from everlaſting." Mic. v. 2. Some indeed underſtand this of their favorite eternal generation, but St. Mathew applies it to the temporal birth of Jeſus, leaving out the laſt words, which only mean that he as then born was from ancient kings. Or that his goings forth in the divine foreordination were before the world was, which is as from everlaſting. Matt. 11. 26. 1. Pet. 1 20.

Here muſt be noticed a material diſtinction between the *real perſonal* and *real political* birth of a king. A ſon cannot be born a God from a God, a King from a King, in the fulneſs of regal power, any more than a man can be born from a man plenarily, with all man like perſonal perfections. When the angels ſpeak of Jeſus as "born Chriſt the Lord," it expreſſes

what he was to be, not what he then was. There was no inveſtiture in his offices at his birth. The child born, was not *a ſon given* till afterwards, much leſs was the government upon his ſhoulder, or He the everlaſting Father, wonderful, counſellor, the mighty God, or the prince of peace. Iſa. ix. 6. Theſe are after titles, and none but the firſt, *a child born*, predicable of him at his birth. Any one who foreknew what Joſeph was to be, might juſt as well ſay at his birth, "This child is in the field, and in Dotham, in the pit, in the dungeon, and riding in the ſecond chariot in Egypt at the ſame time." Jeſus was made Chriſt at his baptiſm, Lord and king at his reſurrection; his coronation day was his birth day as a king. Acts xiii. 33. Pſ. ii. 6, 7. Heb. i. 5.

The angel tells his virgin mother that the Lord God *ſhould give* him the throne of his father David, as *what was future*. As to what ſome call his eſſential power and government, they cannot belong to a child born: and his official capacity did no more commence at his birth, than John the Baptiſt's did at his. His being *born* is not his *coming* into the world; John xviii. 37. the fulneſs of time was not yet come, nor was any Son given, ſanctified, ſealed, or ſent of God at that time: Chriſt was yet to come.

6. The divine and royal nativity of the Son of God, and of David, was *honorary*, and *ennobling*.

It was no humiliating or condeſcending act of His, or any ways humiliating or degrading to Him. He was indeed born an *infant God and King in human form*, and ſubject to the progreſs of nature towards perfection, which is an unavoidable attendant on every birth. It was honored by heaven various ways. If it be an *honor* to be a God and King, it muſt be an *honor* and *dignity* to be born the Son and Heir of the Moſt High. David thought it ennobling to be only the ſon-in-law of an earthly king: how much more honorable muſt it be, to

be the real only begotten Son and Heir of Heaven's Divine Majeſty? His generation and nativity was no more his humiliating act or humiliating to him, than our regeneration is ours, when we become the ſons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. And who ever thought *that* to be his condeſcenſion and diſgrace? Every birth is attended with ſomething of natural imperfection, they are babes, in minority, dependent on parents, ſubject to a natural progreſſion towards perfection, under governors and tutors, and ſo differing nothing from a ſervant. This is unavoidable to the Heir who is to be Lord of all. Gal. iv. 1, 2. The regenerate are firſt babes in Chriſt, and progreſſively grow up to the ſtature of perfect men. Thus Jeſus *grew up to be God, was with God, and ſubſiſted in the form of God*, at the termination of his generative capacity.

II. A deſcription of the agency of the parties concerned in this generation, conception, and nativity, will farther illuſtrate it.

The Lord God the Higheſt, the Father of the Holy Thing, is the firſt agent. And his agency is intimated ſeveral ways. The *power of* Higheſt's overſhadowing the Virgin, is the cauſe of the Holy Thing's being the Son of God. Luke i. 35. At this time, and by this means, the relations of paternity and filiation were conſtituted, by an act of the Father's holy virtuous will. The divine nature, eſſence or life, for they are the ſame, were now given to the Son to be in himſelf, conſtituting Him a Son. See what is written in the firſt chapter concerning the divine nature. The Deity is the God and Father of all ſpirits phyſically conſidered, and there is only a *gradual*, not a ſpecific difference between them. The ſpirit of Jeſus did not now begin to be, any more than the ſpirit doth in human generations, or in the regeneration of chriſtians. Mere phyſical ſpirituality is not the divine nature, as we ſee in devils.

By the divine nature we mean the *life and conſtitution of God, as God, and this is ſanctity, the vital ſubſtance in which his infinite intellect exiſts.* The vital eſſence of God, is divine and eternal life, light and love. The Father hath this in himſelf, of himſelf, or from none, and other beings who partake of it, do ſo by derivation from him. It is an infinite ocean of *vital ſanctity*, and is *imperial* as well as vital; for it is the *dignity* as well as the life of the divine majeſty, who is "glorious or magnificent in holineſs."

Now, the divine nature, in both the above ſenſes, was communicated in this generation to the Holy Thing, in a divine manner, and creature-tranſcendent degree. It is what belongs to no creature neceſſarily, but it is neceſſarily the life of God, and of Jeſus by his Father's gift. The *incorruptible ſeed of God*, was the vital ſubſtance of the Holy Thing born. A ſempiternal principle of *divine vitality*, as joined to his intellect and the human nature, conſtituted his perſon, as ſubject to the progreſs of nature towards perfection. If all the fulneſs of the God head dwelt in him bodily, it muſt be, *ad modum recipientis, according to the capacity of the recipient.* The divine eſſence *comprehenſively as the fountain*, is God's abſolutely, who by its communication becomes a Father, and the Father of the Holy Thing exiſting by ſuch communication, but in a *ſtricter notion*, it is the Father's retained life in himſelf, after he hath given to the Son to have life in himſelf. In the firſt ſenſe it compriſeth the Son's eſſence, and the Father's own perſonal eſſence alſo, becauſe there can be no eſſence in the God-head which is not the Father's as the one God. And yet the Father's retained perſonal life, is not the Son's given or derived life. This derived life is ſo *imparted*, as not to be *divided* from the life of the one God, but is an *undivided derivative* from that as a fountain, and yet has a diſtinct ſubſiſtence in itſelf, as *a living ſtream from a living fountain.* As the living ſtream exiſts in

and by its fountain, ſo the fountain dwells in the ſtream as its ſource: thus the Father and the Son dwell in each, and preſerve their perſonal diſtinctneſs, ſo that the perſonal acts and ſufferings of the one, are not the perſonal acts or ſufferings of the other. And this perſonal diſtinctneſs is preſerved by their intellects exiſting in the one, in the divine nature, the *primitive*, and in the other in the divine nature the *derivative*: the *former* is the Father's, the latter is the Son's life and eſſence. The Son by this generation having diſtinct divine perſonal exiſtence, was Life of Life, Light of Light, Spirit of Spirit, Love of Love, God of God, in his nature and eſſence. As the image is the derivative from the exemplar: ſo the Son is "the engraved image of his Father's perſon." Heb. i. 3. This eſſence the image, in this generation, is vital, and ſubſtantial, and yet without any diviſion, and with ſuch diſtinctneſs as united to the Son's intellect, as to conſtitute perſonality, whereby a diſtinct individual ſubſtance of a diſtinct individual intellectualiſt, and not a mere modality or denomination is derived from the one God. The Son may be allowed to be coeſſential and conſubſtantial with the Father, if ſcholaſtics chooſe theſe terms, but *coeternity* a parte ante, and *cocquality* in power and glory, are repugnant to the nature of things, and to the *primacy* of the Father as the one God. Self, or neceſſary exiſtence, abſolute eternity a parte ante, original, underived power and glory, can never belong to a Son, any more than underived exiſtence can.

The Son was alſo by this generation of the divine *imperial* eſſence, ſince God as eſſentially King begat his ſon and Heir. But though a king's ſon and heir, is the King the Son, yet he is inveſted with no actual government by his perſonal nativity. He is not of the ſubject party, and yet is ſubject to the ſole reigning father as every dutiful ſon will and ought to be. The ſon the King, is exempted from the rule of all but the Father alone.

2. The next agent concerned in the nativity of Jeſus is the Holy Ghoſt.

The Holy Ghoſt is ſaid to come upon the virgin, a common expreſſion, when he applies himſelf to any work of ſanctity, relative to them on whom he comes, or falls. She is therefore ſaid to be with "child of the holy Ghoſt." Matt. 1. 18. In the apoſtle's creed he is ſaid to be "conceived of the Holy Ghoſt:" ſome other creeds ſay, "he was born of the Holy Ghoſt and the Virgin." But as the *power of the Higheſt*, was the cauſe of the Holy Thing's being the Son of God, and no creative act was now exerted, and as neither Jeſus nor chriſtians are the ſons or creatures of the Holy Ghoſt by being born of the Spirit: ſome other agency muſt be aſcribed to the Holy Ghoſt than what is generative, or creative. The Holy Ghoſt is to be conſidered as an *inſpiration agent*, or *inſpiration virtue*. And whether he is to be taken here *perſonally* or *impersonally*, it is probable all the influence was, to enable the virgin to become a Mother without the concurrence of man, *uniting the conſtituent parts of the Holy Thing, and ſanctifying the fruit of her womb*. By the Holy Ghoſt God finiſhes or completes his works of vital ſanctity: *ſpiritality*, if the word may be uſed, is his *kind of thing*. Here was ſpirit born of ſpirit, and not fleſh born of the will of the fleſh.

3. The other party concerned was the Virgin Mary, the mother of the Holy Thing born, called the Son of God.

Mary the ſame with Miriam was a common female name among the Jews: but this highly favored and bleſſed among women, is diſtinguiſhed from others by being eſpouſed to a man named Joſeph, and eſpecially as ſhe was the mother of the Son of God, and yet a *virgin*: for *ſhe knew not a man*, and Jeſus was born *before Joſeph and Mary came together*. Her being a virgin is of ſingular note, becauſe the predictive curſe upon the ſerpent is that the *ſeed of the woman ſhould bruiſe his*

*head:* And the famous prophecy of Iſaiah that "a virgin ſhall conceive and bear a ſon, and call his name Emmanuel." Iſa. vii. 17. The former of theſe is never quoted in the New Teſtament, it being no goſpel preached to man as Luther ſuppoſed, or promiſe made to man, but a curſe pronounced upon the ſerpent, eſtabliſhing his doom: but the latter is applied to Jeſus, whoſe name is equivalent to Emmanuel, being Jah prefixed to Oſhea, which ſignifies the Divine Savior, of the ſame import as God with us.

Modern Jews have tried to give another turn to this text by underſtanding *Alma* to ſignify any young woman, but the ancient Jews, and the relations of the words and the wonder of the ſign given by God himſelf, will juſtify our underſtanding it of a proper virgin who knew not a man. It was never fulfilled in any but Mary, and was literally fulfilled in her, who was a virgin when eſpouſed to Joſeph, and ſo continued until Jeſus was born. But whether ſhe ſo remained ever after we leave to Franciſcans and Dominicans to diſpute.

But this is certain, marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled, and no paſt acts in that relation could prejudice the virginity of Mary when the Holy Thing was begotten, conceived, and born. Her maternal acts were a proper *conception, progreſſive nutrition,* Luke i. 42. *and actual parturtition.* It was expedient that he ſhould be *human divine in his natures,* and no deſcendant from the animal Adam, ſubject to, or involved in, any of his evils. The honor put upon this bleſſed Maid entitles her to eſteem and bleſſing from all generations, but not to worſhip. Jeſus was born of a woman, that being of the one *ſex,* and deſcended from the *other,* He might ſave both men and women. Now the unjuſt reproach is wiped off from that worthy part of our ſpecies, which hath been caſt upon them by ſons of Adam and Eve, becauſe the latter being *deceived,* was firſt in the tranſgreſſion, when Adam not beguiled, yet alſo

tranſgreſſed. They may now hold up their heads, *as more of good* hath come by one of their *ſex* than *of evil* came by another. And to the honor of females, it is noted, that to them Jeſus firſt appeared after his reſurrection, as they had been ſteady attendants upon him in his miniſtry; and they have been more generally friends of Chriſt and his religion than men. Few or none have denied his revelation or divinity, and more in proportion have embraced and adorned the chriſtian profeſſion. Seldom is the woman an hinderance to the man's being a chriſtian, but rather a help thereunto: while often hath the woman to encounter the temptation to infidelity from the man, and to follow Chriſt without him.

III. The natures, dignity, ſtate, and character of the Son of God and of David, as a child born, before he was a Son given, remain to be conſidered, in order to the full underſtanding of him in his perſonal, generative capacity.

As the angel announced to the Virgin that the Holy thing to be born of her ſhould be *called*, Luke 1. 32. John iii. 1. ſo he really was the Son of God the Higheſt. He hath been proved to be divine by nature, the Holy Son and Heir of the Divine Majeſty by the communication of the divine vital and imperial eſſence. If God was *ſterile*, and the divine nature had not a power of *fecundity*, there never could have been any firſt born Son, who is *divine and imperial* only, or many brethren who are *creatures and ſubjects alſo*.

Jeſus alſo had the human nature as conſtituitive of his one perſon. By the human nature we underſtand nothing now all common to men, that God might manifeſt them, and to beaſt. Eccl. iii. 18. &c. This Holy Thing was not born a beaſt as the children of Adam are in their preſent eſtate, with reſpect to all that the fathers of their fleſh are the authors of. The offspring of God the father of ſpirits, the children partakers of fleſh and blood, are not ſo denominated from the fleſh and

blood they are the partakers of: for that is animal and corruptible, the creature subject to vanity, and the bondage of corruption. Heb. ii. 14. Rom. viii. 19. &c. And certainly this was not the estate of the Holy Thing at his birth. Yet he had proper humanity of nature in a true body and a reasonable soul. In this true body he was distinguished from angels, as he is now since his resurrection in a body of flesh and bones. Luke xxiv. 39. Neither the divine nor human nature are intellectualists, but in them the intellect of Jesus existed, and they are vital substances necessary there-with to constitute personality, but are no agents of themselves.

His dignity was that of Son and Heir, even though in infancy, minority, and subjection to a progression towards perfection. But He could not be born a God from a God plenarily, nor a King from a King with regal authority. No heir of a king can be possessed of royal power while his father lives but by *appointment*. Heb. i. 1. The great Jehovah cannot die. But though this child born could not have all human divine, personal and royal perfections at once, yet he had the natures and essences of them: and he *grew, waxed strong in spirit and increased in stature and wisdom*. The essentialities of humanity and divinity, were in him *seminally* by his generation and conception, and *completely*, though *in miniature*, by and at his birth. Great things may grow out of small under the influence of the God of nature and of grace. "The stone cut out of the mountain without hands may fill the whole earth." Dan. ii. 34. Being born of a woman an helpless infant in human form, he needed food, cloathing and protection, as other children. Every one will own the incorruptible seed of God is unperishable, as also the immortal spirit of man: the human body alone of Jesus could be hurt, and it may well be questioned how far that could be injured, or whether it could be injured at all, being *spirit* born of spirit, and if liable to any external violence, it

muſt be as the *fruit* of the virgin's womb. The attempt of Herod to kill him, and the command of God to Joſeph to flee into Egypt, argue nothing againſt the above ſuppoſition; becauſe God could have protected him from Herod there, if he was liable to external violence: but it was not wholly the fear of Herod's power, or the liability of the young child to his violence, that cauſed that movement, but the fulfilment of a prophecy. He was truly a middle perſon between God and men, excluſive of the animal nature of men, without any imperfection or deficiency excepting what is unavoidable in minority.

As to the extent of the capacity of the ſpirit of man, we are but imperfect judges: we ſee how far it hath reached in a Locke, Newton, Milton, &c. And if the ſpirit of Jeſus was the firſt in degree, time and capacity, of all derived ſpirits, in the human and divine natures now united to it, it might be capable of infinite progreſſion, as his perſon *grew, waxed ſtrong in ſpirit, ſpirit* born of ſpirit, *increaſing in wiſdom as in ſtature.* Luke ii. 40, 52. The wiſdom was not of this world, but heavenly: not ſuch as reaſon, fleſh and blood, or man teacheth, but ſuch as is of God. When twelve years old, the time when children took upon them the yoke of religion among the Jews, he was found in the midſt of their doctors, hearing them, and aſking them queſtions, to the aſtoniſhment of all that heard him at his underſtanding and anſwers. Both the divine and human nature in him enabled him to make great progreſs in ſanctity and the knowledge of the holy, and to be filled with the fulneſs of God in proportion to the capacity of the recipient. As he tarried behind at Jeruſalem unbeknown to his parents, to be examined by the doctors, or rather to examine them: Joſeph and Mary miſſing him, returned to find him, and finding him chid him for putting them to ſo much concern and trouble. "Behold," ſaith his mother, "thy father and I have ſought thee ſorrowing." His anſwer is laconic, but pregnant with

more ſenſe than ſhe then underſtood, or many have ſuppoſed ſince to be in it. "He ſaid unto them, how is it, that ye ſought me? wiſt ye not that I muſt be about my Father's buſineſs?" "But they underſtood not the ſaying which he ſpake unto them," as others have not after all the conſequent explanations of it. "And he went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was ſubject unto them. But his mother kept all theſe ſayings in her heart: and Jeſus increaſed in wiſdom and ſtature, and in favor with God and man." We read no more of Jeſus for eighteen years, even until his public miniſtry commenced, when he began to be about thirty years of age. Among the few who have thought of this matter, it hath puzzled them how to account for ſo long ſilence, in four Evangeliſts who undertook to write his life, as to the better half of it. To fill up this ſpace, tradition, that dernier reſort, hath been recurred to, and with its common ill ſucceſs. The tradition is this, upon the credit of Juſtin Martyr: "That Jeſus lived retired with Joſeph, learned and worked at the carpenter's trade, or that ſpecies of it making ox yokes, to be a pattern to all children in induſtry, ſubjection to parents, and providing for them in their ſtraits." Origen, a father leſs credulous, of ſuperior capacity, and furniſhed with equal means of information, denies the tradition, but how he ſolves the difficulty, we know not. But as neither of them had any perſonal knowledge of the matter, nor any other authentic revelation than we have, we are at leaſt as good judges as they were, from reaſon, ſcripture, and the analogy of things.

As on the determination of this matter, we ſuppoſe the honor of Jeſus is depending, as well as the clearing up many paſſages of ſcripture concerning him, and the tradition itſelf, hath ſolely the contradiction of ſinners againſt himſelf, for its ground: it ought to have a fair diſcuſſion that the reader may judge of himſelf what is right: and eſpecially as the truth of the *heavenly* miſſion of Jeſus depends upon it.

It appears to be a groundleſs inconſiſtent old wives fable, diſhonorary to the Son of God and of David, when it is conſidered that he was no Son of Adam, or ſubject to get his bread by the ſweat of his face: and was deſignated for the higheſt office in the kingdom of God, and it was needful for him to be otherwiſe employed to qualify him for it: and as to the ſuppoſed example of induſtry and providing for the ſtraits of parents: we have no account either of their poverty, or his filial piety in that particular. If he had been eighteen years at work diligently, he might have had ſome property, and where to have lain his head in his public miniſtry: and being ſo uſed to manual labor, we might have read of his putting his hand to ſome work, in his ſtraits, which we never do throughout his life. Was he ſo buſy all this time at his trade, as never to appear in the temple, where all males were obliged to be three times a year? or if *there*, never to ſay or do any thing worthy of record? to oppoſe theſe valid reaſons, we have only ſome ignorant and malicious queſtions evidently deſigned to deſtroy his uſefulneſs, as his anſwer implies. "Is not this the carpenter, is not this the carpenter's ſon?" Matt. xiii. 55, 56. Mark xi. 3. Theſe or others ſaid, "he was a gluttonous man, a wine bibber, and a friend to publicans and ſinners. Matt. xi. 19. Let both be believed or neither, as they ſtand upon the ſame ground of ignorance, malice and ſpite.

But when we look upon the other ſide we ſee ſcripture and reaſon. His anſwer to his Mother, "wiſt ye not that I muſt be about my Father's buſineſs?" hath another meaning than that he was in future to be employed by Joſeph, who was not his father, in making ox yokes.

His mother never ſuppoſed this, though ſhe did not underſtand him, but, "kept theſe ſayings in her heart," for after diſcoveries. If he was after this ſubject to his parents, it was only ſo far as this other buſineſs permitted. He had nothing

to do or to learn farther on earth, but while here, he was "in favor with God, and with man," ſo far and long as man knew him. The Holy Jeſus was in his minority training up for uſefulneſs in piety, and ſubjection to parents, and is therein a fit pattern for youth to follow. But when the time of his native ſervitude under governors and tutors, as appointed by the Father, was out, we find him by an eſſential remove actually in heaven with God, under his divine inſtruction and tuition. He was to be, and actually was, a teacher ſent from God, to declare and teſtify, what he had ſeen, heard, or learned of him, and to repeat commandments from his mouth. Some prophets were trained up in ſchools or colleges under eminent maſters, ſuch as Elijah and Eliſha, but Jeſus was deſigned to be, and was *a prophet above all, as coming from above*, not at his birth, but in his miſſion.

We may account for this aſcentional remove as eaſily as for that of Enoch or Elijah, or his own after reſurrection.

But here the great cry is, why have we no witneſſes of this? The queſtion comes with an ill grace from thoſe who put it, and ſhews the blinding influence of traditional prejudice. They believe an eternal Logos or Son, deſcended from heaven, entered the virgin's womb, and condeſcended to be born. Surely ſo great an event as "the eternal God's becoming a mortal man," as ſome ſpeak, muſt have many witneſſes. But where are they, or one ſcripture aſſertion of the fact?

A few witneſſes to his eternal divinity would have been a mighty help to ſcholaſtic orthodoxy, and it really needs it. But alas! there is no ſupport to the baſeleſs fabric. That ſuch an aſcent is conceivable, appears from what Chriſt was and did after his reſurrection. At times he was with the diſciples for forty days, eat and drank and converſed with them, appeared and diſappeared at pleaſure, even when *doors* were ſhut; and might have many aſcents and deſcents in that time:

we never read of his lodging with them, and he never appeared in the temple, was no inhabitant of this world any more than angels are upon occaſional meſſages, but was detained from a final departure by ſpecial reaſons. The angels ſent to miniſter to the heirs of ſalvation, *always* behold their Father's face in heaven. Jeſus might after his twelfth year conſider himſelf as no inhabitant of this world, and yet be ſometimes in it, known to his mother and ſome few friends with whom he was in favor, and, at the expiration of his generative capacity, come in his miniſtry into the world, as *ſanctified, ſealed*, and *ſent*.

There was good reaſon for his aſcentional remove, and there is no need of any other teſtimony of it than we have. Heaven was his Father's houſe and court, where the divine king's ſon and heir at the termination of his minority ought to be. If a great king beget a ſon and heir, of a virtuous ſubject princeſs in a far country, deſigning him hereafter to reſtore the revolted ſubjects in that country to their allegiance, it muſt have a happy tendency towards their return: and it is equally fitting that he ſhould remain with his mother under ſuch governors, and tutors, as were proper for a time: but when by a growth up into his father's image, and a conformity to him, and he is fit for his father's preſence, it is highly proper he ſhould be removed to ſee his father, learn his mode of government, and under him be qualified for his after work, give his actual explicit conſent to undertake it, receive his commiſſion and credentials, with ſuitable inſtructions, and from thence to ſet out to execute his office. For ſome ſuch purpoſes Jeſus went to be with God. He had proceeded as far as the Jewiſh pedagogue could lead him in divine knowledge, and therefore went to heaven to read the *volume of the book* Pſ. xl. 7. of God's predeſtination, and have the old teſtament prophecies explained concerning himſelf. *There* only he could find *one* to give him a comprehenſive view of the plan of redemption, ſee his own ſore-

ordination before the foundation of the world, the Father's love to him before the world was, and what glory he had with him, who calleth things that are not, as though they were, as a reward of his mediatorial work.

Then in proſpect of the joy ſet before him, he engaged to make his ſoul an offering for ſin, upon condition of ſeeing his ſeed. This divines have called the covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son. It could not be between any eternal Logos or eternal Son, becauſe if any ſuch had exiſted, he had no *ſoul* to offer. The Father having then revealed his deſigns as to men, the Son, as allied to them by the birth of a woman, voluntarily, of holy benevolence, engages to comply with his Father's propoſal, and to lay his own perſonal advantage by, to be, do, and ſuffer, what ſhould be for his Father's honor and the general good. In ſo doing he quitted his claim to hereditary honour, and accepted of an *appointment* to be heir of all things; And though rich became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich. All this was the act of Jeſus himſelf, and not of any eternal Son, or Logos. He went to heaven to have the plan unfolded to him, to be inſtructed in all the parts of it, to yield his explicit conſent to it: and there to tarry in glory, until the fulneſs of time ſhould come, as to the divine foreordination, the divine prophecies, and his own age, for his being ſanctified, ſealed, and ſent into the world.

What hath been ſuppoſed above is not only poſſible, but probable, and the aſcent and deſcent of Jeſus after his birth, and prior to his public miniſtry, as a matter of *fact*, ſhall be attempted to be proved, from plain ſcripture. And in order to this it will be neceſſary to prove his being in heaven when John began his miniſtry, then his aſcent there, and his deſcent from thence in his own miniſtry will be evident. As to Jeſus, who was born at Bethlehem, being in heaven when John began

his miniſtry, and before his own miſſion and coming in to the world, we prove it from John firſt, firſt, as compared with other ſcriptures. "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. The ſame was in the beginning with God." The learned do, and the unlearned may, know what hath been written to pervert and wreſt this eaſy text of ſcripture from its natural, obvious, and popular ſenſe, to one totally foreign from the ſubject the Evangeliſt is treating of, and which hath nothing but Plato, a heathen, and tradition from him, to ſupport it. Much hath been written of the reaſons of John's undertaking to write his goſpel, and more of what ſome platonic philoſophers have ſaid of the *ſublimity* of it, who underſtood nothing of it, and that it ought to have been written in letters of gold. The ſcriptures explain themſelves, and we need no help from ſuch as are of this world, and belong to the God of it, to explain plain revelation. No natural man ever conceived of what John hath written. The Platonic Logos, and Rabbinical Membra, are both different from St. John's word.

John, the beloved diſciple and moſt intimate friend of Jeſus, is allowed to have been the writer of the goſpel which bears his name, after he was far advanced in life, had outlived the other Apoſtles, and had ſeen the riſe of many errors to the perverſion of the true faith once delivered to the Saints. Antichriſts had come who denied *Jeſus to be the Chriſt*, or *that he had come in fleſh*, as may be ſeen in his Epiſtles. I. John ix. 4. II. John 7.

He had alſo in view the completion of the goſpel hiſtory by the ſupply of what others had omitted.

1. Like other hiſtorians, he ſets out from a well known epoch or æra, which he calls *beginning*.

Thus Moſes began his hiſtory with the creation of our terreſtrial Syſtem. Some by John's beginning underſtand

*eternity*, though that hath no beginning : others say *before all worlds* : and not a few say in the *Mosaic beginning* ; and to perpetuate the last conceit, marginal references are inserted in some bibles, in *Genesis* and John. But John's beginning is not so early as the birth of Jesus, nor so late as the commencement of his public ministry. We cannot miss the time, if he and the other evangelists are allowed to interpret his sense. If a writer uses a word *many times* in a known determinate sense, for *once* in a disputed sense, and even that once may be best understood as the others, nay if it make *no sense*, to put any other meaning upon it, but spoils and mars the whole : it is *abusive* to put this perverted construction upon it. In this manner hath John been treated. Mark and John begin their gospels at the same date even with John Baptist's *ministry*. Mark i. 1, 2. Here even Mr. Henry saith, "the gospel did not begin so soon as the birth of Christ, for he took time to increase in wisdom and stature : nor so late as his entering upon his own public ministry, but half a year before, when John began to preach." This is John's beginning, and *in it*, the word was, and was with God. Nothing can be plainer, or more determinate. "The law and the prophets were until John," then a new epoch commenced. Luke xvi. 16. When the place of Judas was to be filled up, it was to be out of those men which had accompanied with the Apostles, all that time the Lord Jesus went in and out among them, beginning, Acts i. 22. at the baptism of John. Beginning at John's baptising any, for some of John's disciples were afterwards the followers of Jesus, or beginning at his baptising Christ himself. St. Luke uses the word beginning in the same sense. "Who from the *beginning* were ministers and eye witnesses of the word." Luke i. 2. So John explains himself, "That which was from the *beginning*, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of

the word of life: that which we have ſeen and heard declare we unto you: for the life was manifeſted, and we have ſeen it, and bear witneſs and ſhew unto you, that eternal life which was *with the Father*, and was manifeſted unto us." I. John i. 1. 2. 3. The ſame perſon is denoted by the life and eternal life, that in the goſpel is called the word with God: whom they never ſaw or handled until he came in fleſh and dwelt *among them*. *From* that ſame beginning, in which beginning the word ſubſiſted with God, they ſaw and handled him who is the perſonal life eternal which had been with the Father, with God, but was now manifeſted. "Ye were with me from the *beginning*: Jeſus knew from the *beginning* who ſhould betray him." John xv. 27. vi. 64. viii. 25. xvi. 4. I. John ii. 2, 25. and iii. 3. II. John v. 6.

2. In the beginning was the Word.

Here is a proof of St. John's ſimplicity in barely aſſerting that the Word *was*, or had a real ſubſiſtence. But who did not know the Word *was*, with a *ſneer*, ſay ſcholaſtics, if the Word was Jeſus after his birth, and not yet made fleſh? the anſwer ſhall be ſeriouſly. When Moſes began his hiſtory, he doth not ſay in the beginning God *was*, becauſe men already had ſufficient notices of his being from creation. But John, writing of a perſon whoſe exiſtence could not be known by natural light, and whoſe *creation* as well as kingdom was not of this world, ſaith the Word *was* or had a real being. Who is the word? not wiſdom in Prov. viii. Wiſdom is of another *ſex*, ſiſter to Prudence, allied to Charity whom St. Paul perſonifies. I. Cor. xiii. Mr. Henry hath this law quibble. "Word is two-fold, word conceived, word uttered, the firſt is thought, the other is ſpeech, thought is the conception of, and one with the ſoul, and therefore the ſecond perſon is fitly called the Word, being the firſt begotten of the Father, as thought is of the ſoul." After quoting Prov. viii. he goes

on, "And as there is word uttered which is ſpeech, thus Chriſt is the Word as the Father hath ſpoken to us by him. John Baptiſt was the *voice*, but Chriſt the Word." Wretched ſtuff! ſcholaſtic huſks! Leclerk ſaith "In the beginning was *reaſon*;" a mighty ſubject of goſpel revelation! others ſay the Word is a certain eternal Son of God, and ſome, He is the Supreme God under a ſecond denomination. But John never bare witneſs to the exiſtence of any ſuch perſon. A few ſay the word is firſt born, before the creation and the moſt glorious creature. John tells us plainly who the Word is, even the ſame with the Light, the Life, the eternal Life which was with the Father, the ſame John bare witneſs of, who came to his own, and his own received him not: the ſame with the only begotten; the ſame with Jeſus Chriſt; John i. 6, 11, 14, 17, 18. called the Word becauſe he hath declared the Father, and hath the words of eternal life. The *Word of God* ſtill retains his name with *a garment dipt in blood*, Rev. xix. 13. which no abſtract Logos, or eternal Son, or firſt born before the creation, ever had. Scholaſtics have impoſed a figment, a non entity, for Jeſus Chriſt who came in fleſh, and totally change the *ſubject*, miſtake the *time*, and the *nature*, of the incarnation, and in the room of an important *reality*, ſubſtitute a *nothing*.

3. The *Word* in the beginning was *with* God.

"We ſhew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifeſt unto us." He was *with God*, as we ſay of a good man departed, he *is gone* to God. He repeats it for the greater confirmation as John's manner is. *The ſame was in the beginning with God.*

In the beginning of John's miniſtry, the Word was with God, not yet made fleſh, nor come to dwell among the Apoſtles. If we could not tell how Jeſus went to be with God, or what he went there for, we ought to believe the fact upon John's teſtimony, nay upon Chriſt's own repeated aſſertion,

who was the true witneſs. John iii. 33. They both affirm he aſcended there, was in heaven, and came from thence in his miſſion. The proof of this matter of faſt being important as to the miſſion of Chriſt, a few of the many texts that ſpeak of it ſhall be produced. Whole chapters almoſt, ſpeak of his coming from heaven, not as an eternal Son or Logos, but as the *ſon of man*, a title he gives himſelf, and which belonged not to him in his generative capacity. Diſcourſing with Nicodemus, he ſaith, "Verily, verily I ſay unto thee, we ſpeak that we do know, and teſtify that we have ſeen: and ye receive not our witneſs. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how ſhall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things? And no man hath aſcended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the ſon of man, which *was* in heaven." John iii. 11, 12, 13. Our tranſlation, which *is* in heaven, is not right nor true. The original word is in the paſt as well as preſent time: and the ſon of man could not be *in* heaven while talking with them on earth. Here is firſt an aſcent to heaven from earth, then a deſcent from heaven to earth, and an affirmation that he was in heaven, after his aſcent, and before his deſcent. And the whole is predicated of the ſon of man, a name not aſſumed or given him only in his miniſtry. It is not ſpoken of any eternal Son or Logos, or of the divine nature, for a nature cannot aſcend or deſcend without the perſon whoſe nature it is. John the Baptiſt teſtifies the ſame thing in the ſame chapter. "He that cometh from above, is above all (prophets): he that is of the earth, is earthy, and ſpeaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all, and what he hath ſeen and heard, that he teſtifieth, and no man receiveth his teſtimony, he that receiveth his teſtimony hath ſet to his ſeal that God is true." In this his preeminence to all other prophets conſiſted, that he had *ſeen* and *heard*, what he declared. In the ſixth chapter of

John, Chriſt diſcourſeth largely of himſelf as the *bread* of life which came down from heaven; "And the bread that I will give is my fleſh, which I will give for the life of the world." The Jews underſtood him literally and queſtioned about it: and when many of his diſciples ſaid, "This is an hard ſaying, who can hear it? And when Jeſus knew in himſelf that they murmured at it, he ſaid unto them, doth this offend you? John vi. 60, 61, 62. What, and if ye ſhall ſee the ſon of man aſcend up where he was before? Nothing can be plainer than this. It is predicated of no Son of God, not the ſon of man, nor of any divine nature. The word *before*, doth not relate to his birth, but his miſſion; for it hath been validly proved that there was no ſuch perſon under any denomination prior to the birth of Jeſus. "He that deſcended is the ſame that aſcended far above all heavens." Eph. ix. 10. Mr. Pool's corps are much pinched here. "He ſaith not, he that aſcended is the ſame that deſcended, leſt it ſhould be thought that Chriſt brought his body with him from heaven, but on the contrary, *He that deſcended is the ſame that aſcended*, to ſhew that the Son of God did not become other by his deſcent than what he was, nor the aſſumption of the human nature add any thing, as a man is not made other by the *clothes* he puts on." Thus the human nature according to them, is no eſſentiality of the perſon of Chriſt. But this is guarded againſt. "He that aſcended, what is it but that he deſcended firſt: He had aſcended firſt of all, then deſcended, and hath now aſcended, and will deſcend again. Jeſus was born here human divine, without the clothes of fleſh, went to God without them, came from God in his miſſion, and put them on here for a little while, put them off at his death, went to heaven without them; but theſe cloaths are not the human but animal nature. The ſame perſon ſaith, "I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myſelf, but *he ſent me*." John viii. 42. "He which is of God,

he hath ſeen the Father." "I came out from God, I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world and go to the Father. His diſciples ſaid, lo, now ſpeakeſt thou plainly: We believe that thou cameſt forth from God." John xvi. 28, 29, 30. The ſame that came from the Father was to return again, and in the ſame ſenſe: but he could not come from God in his miſſion, unleſs he had firſt gone to be with God. "Jeſus knew that he was come from God and went to God." John xiii. 3. His birth was no coming in his miſſion; God did not give his only begotten Son at his nativity. But why were there no ſpectators of the ſuppoſed aſcent and deſcent? Anſwer: becauſe it concerned none but himſelf; he had received no commiſſion, and was not ſent. But when the Father *ſanctified*, *ſealed*, and *ſent him*, it was from heaven, where he had been with God.

4. *And the Word was God.*

The ſame Word, in the ſame beginning was properly God: He was not that God with whom he was, but the only begotten of that God, now arrived to perfection by the progreſs of nature he was born ſubject unto. God here is without an article in the Greek, to diſtinguiſh him from the Father, and ot denote that He was not in *ſtate* God; that is in a reigning condition, veſted with any power of actual government. This is the God afterwards manifeſt in fleſh. And while he was with the God and was God, *He ſubſiſted in the form of God*. Phil. ii. 6. As to this form and his leaving of it for *fleſh*, it will come under conſideration in the next chapter.

It appears, from the above deſcription of the Son of God and of David in his generative capacity, that He was perſonally fit to act as a mediator between God and men, if ever called thereunto.

As the divine nature and human nature are both united in his perſon, he is exactly a middle perſon between God and men,

conſidering men as the offſpring of God. But as yet he had not become fleſh by partaking of the animal nature of the Sons of Adam in their preſent eſtate that God might manifeſt them. His perſonal conſtitution, origination, and native hereditary accompliſhments are ſuch, that neither the one God the Father nor the children of God now ſubject to vanity, have any cauſe of fear to truſt him with their concerns, or that he will be unequal to the execution of any office devolved upon him, by the Father of Spirits and creator of ſouls, for the redemption and reſtoration of theſe loſt ſheep now ſtrayed from the fold of the one Shepherd and ſupreme Biſhop of ſouls. The Son of God born of a woman is allied to both God and men, and is fit to mediate between both. Being the engraved image of his Father's perſon, His only Begotten and well beloved Son, He will therefore pleaſe his God and Father and not himſelf, and come into any propoſed expedient which wiſdom and benevolence may deviſe for the recapitulation of all things. As a male born of a female of our ſpecies, both ſexes may have hope for his interpoſition as a *kinſman redeemer*. While Jeſus was God with God in heaven, there was a fuller viſible equality between God and him. Tranſacting with God for man in the covenant of redemption, he as God, ſubſiſted in the form of God. But when he came down to earth, we ſhall ſee he acts as the man God's Fellow conformed to the preſent eſtate of the Sons of men, and even in the form of a ſervant, in the *likeneſs of ſinful fleſh*.

Having the glory of God at heart, and a compaſſionate feeling for men, we may view him as ſtanding ready in the imperial court of heaven, waiting for the fulneſs of time to come, when the ſovereign mandate ſhall be iſſued for his deſcent into our world to aſſume *a body fitted for him*, Heb. x. 5. to act the mediator and ſaviour, in the offices of a Prophet, Prieſt, and King, of the Moſt High. The holy writers who had a

right idea of the native dignity, and riches of Jesus, the only begotten of the Father, feel enraptured when they speak of his condescension and humiliation, not in being born, but in becoming incarnate for a little while. A more accomplished person cannot be conceived of for this work. This is David in the antitype, God's Son and Heir, becoming his servant voluntarily, whom God hath found and chosen, and anointed to execute the office of a redeeming, new creating, and restoring God. This leads to a subject, the admiration of angels, the joy of men, and the astonishment of devils, and the ground and pillar of the truth, even the great mystery of godliness, God manifest in *flesh*.

## CHAP. VI.

### OF THE INCARNATION, HUMILIATION, AND MISSION OF CHRIST.

*The mystery of Godliness, or the incarnation of the Messiah Jesus Christ explained: The form of God: His becoming flesh in the form of a servant: in the likeness of men: His humiliation unto death: Exaltation to the throne of God: And the restitution of all things into the kingdom of God all in all, &c.*

THE great mystery of godliness, is the Word's "being made, or becoming flesh;" the same with the "manifestation of God in flesh;" the same with the "coming of Jesus Christ in flesh." John i. 14. I. Tim. iii. 16. I. John iv. 2. This is the ground and pillar of the truth, as it ought to be translated, and not the church. I. Tim. iii. 15. As known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world and before, he *forordained* Christ before the foundation of the world to be the saviour of it, and subordinate to this foreordination, he created

our world and man, formed the feveral economies of religion, begat his own Son Jefus, and trained him up to a fitnefs for the office of Chrift, when the foreordination expired and the fulnefs of time came for his miffion into the world. The holy Jefus being all fubmiffion to his Father's will comes, as fent upon this errand, *fanctified*, fet apart to the work, *fealed*; commiffioned as under the broad feal of heaven, to perform the arduous undertaking. He comes from God the Father, with whom we left him in the preceding chapter, to do that which was written in the *volume* of God's book concerning him. He was made flefh, came in flefh, to dwell or tabernacle among the apoftles. But previous to this, the form of God he fubfifted in as God with God muft be laid afide. Phil. ii. 6. This is the voluntary act of Jefus Chrift and not of any eternal Son or Logos. As fcholaftics have changed the fupreme object of worfhip, the only true God the Father, for a triune deity, or "moft bleffed effence confifting of three perfons:" So they have totally changed the *fubject* of the inanition, and incarnation, from Jefus Chrift, to a *fictitious* perfon of their own invention who was neither Jefus nor Chrift, but became fo, as they fuppofe, at his birth, which they erroneoufly call his incarnation. With the change of the fubject they have alfo changed the time of it: and the *nature*, as they fuppofe this eternal Son then took to himfelf "a true body and a reafonable foul," which is fomething more than Jefus himfelf's *becoming flefh*. Heb. ii. 14.

The fcripture idea of the incarnation is precifely no more than the *farkofis* becoming flefh of Jefus Chrift, at that beginning which fucceeded the termination of his generative capacity, and was the commencement of his miffive economy. The farkofis means no more than that at the defcent of Jefus from heaven, and coming into our world, after emptying himfelf of the form of God, he affumed an animal body fitted for him, for a little while called flefh, flefh and blood. And thus com-

ing in flesh he was anointed, made God's Messiah by the descent of the Holy Ghost at his baptism by John.

In every *state* after the person of Jesus was constituted by his Bethlehemetical generation and nativity, he remains the same essentially human divine, of two natures in one person. The several states he passes through do not alter his person, but so change his condition, that things rightly predicated of him in one state, are not compatible to him in another state. The becoming incarnate was only for a little while, a temporary thing: the days of his flesh were only during his ministry on earth, and are now over, but his essential divinity and humanity are the same yesterday, to day, and forever. In Isaiah ix. 6. and Philip. ii. 5, 11, we have three states of Jesus Christ mentioned at once; and in I. Cor. xv. 28. &c. a fourth.

Before these states are explained let the Reader keep the following rules in mind.

1. That the same identical person is spoken of in each state even Jesus the Son of God, and no eternal Son or Logos. He is the child born, the word made flesh, the son given, God manifest in flesh, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, &c.

2. That his person is essentially the same in every state, form, and condition, human divine in his natures as hath been described.

3. That he was in no two states, forms or conditions at one and the same time, but relinquished the one for the other. When a child born, he was no Son given, when in the form of God, he was not in the form of a servant in the likeness of men, in flesh, or the likeness of sinful flesh: much less was he the mighty God or the everlasting Father when a child born, or Son given, nor was any government upon his shoulder until his exaltation.

4. The order of these states must be carefully observed.

The progression is from a child to a son, to a mighty God and everlasting Father: and if one state is taken away, or misplaced,

the argument is loſt, and confuſion introduced. If the firſt ſtate, the form of God is taken away, there is no room for the incarnation and humiliation: and if in the firſt, or ſecond, the eſſential government was poſſeſſed, the exaltation would be a *degradation* as ſome make it, from the eſſential to the mediatorial throne. For as to the exaltation of a nature without the perſon, it is nonſenſe. The fourth ſtate is a return to the firſt. I. Cor. xv. 28. &c. The firſt and laſt ſtates are perſonal, the two middle ones are official.

Theſe four ſtates ſhall be conſidered and explained in their order.

1. The *form of God* is that ſtate ſubſiſted in by the *child born*, at the termination of his generative capacity or economy.

This is what belonged to Jeſus when he was with the God, and was God in the beginning of the Goſpel epoch. It is what he had grown up to, and poſſeſſed by native hereditary right. *Morphe*, the word tranſlated form, is the external figure, ſhape, or appearance of a perſon. Matt. xvii. 2. Mark xvi. 12. Chriſt was transformed on the mount, and appeared in another *form* to his diſciples. Satan and his miniſters can transform themſelves. II. Cor. xi. 14, 15. It ſuppoſes ſubſtance, but never ſignifies what is eſſential. It is an exterior appendage of God: Jeſus emptied himſelf of it, but never laid aſide any thing ſubſtantial. Deiformity is that exterior condition and majeſty which accompanies ſubſtance as the ſhadow doth the body. It belonged to Jeſus as the Son and Heir, and was analogous to the majeſtatic exterior port, guiſe and form of a King's Son and Heir, which is tranſcendant to that of ſubjects, as this was creature-tranſcendent. In all appearances of God in the Old Teſtament there was a glory attending them, which was luminous and reſplendent. *God is light, Chriſt is the true light, the Son of righteouſneſs.* Light hath both a

*ſubſtance* and a *form*, and the form is a luminous emanation from, and concomitant of the ſubſtance. A philoſopher ſaid of God "light was his body and truth his ſoul." Now what the form of Jeſus was in heaven as the expreſs image of his Father's perſon, and brightneſs of his glory, you may learn from his own transformation on the mount, which was a return to this condition for a little while, not by any change of ſubſtance, but of outward figure. Matt. xvii. 2. Mark ix. 23. Luke ix. 29. Then they "beheld his glory, as the glory of the only begotten of the Father." *And were eye witneſſes of his majeſty.* John i. 14. II. Pet. i. 16, 17.

Whenever celeſtials have made their appearance, it hath been commonly in ſome luminous form. The divine ſchekinah was of this kind. The *countenance* of the angel, was like *lightning* and *his raiment white as ſnow*, who rolled the ſtone from the ſepulchre. Where ſaints have had intimate communion with God, ſomething of this form hath been imparted, as *Moſes' face ſhone, and Stephen's was as it had been the face of an angel.* Exod. xxxiv. 30. Act. vi. 15. As Jeſus grew to be more like God in his internal ſubſtantial form, the rays of divinity became more refulgent, and he was in his ſpiritual body more glorious than any creature. And the ſame brightneſs is communicated to all beings in proportion to their ſanctity, which is divinity, and this keeps pace with their nearneſs to God. Angels and ſaints are light, Satan is total darkneſs. Judge of the form of Jeſus then from what it is now. Rev. i. 13, 14. Suppoſe what ought to be, an earthly court where virtue and merit are the ſole rule of honor and ſplendor. The King as ſupreme is the fountain of virtue and honor to all his nobles, officers, and ſubjects. Their forms are more or leſs reſplendent according to their nearneſs to him in the ſubſtantial form of his perſon, which is virtue. The prince the only begotten and heir, to whom is derived his Father's nature in a

ſuperior degree to what any others poſſeſs it, and whom he hath moſt imitated, ſo that when arrived to manhood He is moſt his image and brightneſs, in manlike and kinglike accompliſhments. It is plain this royal ſon muſt excel all others *in external port, form, and ſplendor*, becauſe he exceeds them all, in the *internal ſubſtantial form of virtue*. And although this prince is veſted with no governing authority, yet is he ſubject to none but his father. Every comer to court, every officer and ſubject, will view him to be of ſuperior dignity to them, and as ſubſiſting in the moſt perfect form of the king of any of them, and as meriting ſuch perſonal reſpect as is not due to any ſubject, even when they pay him no direct acts of ſovereign honor.

Such was the ſtate of Jeſus while in the form of God, with all the advantage, that heavenly things have above earthly. he was incorruptible, impaſſable, immortal, inviſible at pleaſure, unſubject to any but his Father, glorious and happy, the ſacred inviolable *one* of the Holy *One*. In this ſtate he might have ever remained, but for the redemption of mankind. In this he was a voluntary agent, and diſcovered the ſublimeſt piety in not pleaſing himſelf but his Father, and the moſt conſummate benevolence in not ſeeking his own things, but the things of others. If he had then poſſeſſed the eſſential government, it is hard to ſay how he could have relinquiſhed it, and as the exerciſe of it muſt have been according to God's holy ſpiritual moral law, which none but holy angels had kept, devils and men could only have felt his iron ſceptre in righteouſneſs, and the latter could never have been ſaved, for the law could not give them life.

There is a ſentence connected with the form of God, that hath been diverſely tranſlated. Some prefer our reading, "He thought it no robbery to be equal with God." But ſome read it, "He did not covet to appear as God." Or as

others, "He was not fond of appearing as God, or tenacious of retaining his equality to God." Let critics settle this point. As a Son, He had an equality of nature to God, which He could not empty himself of: but equality of nature infers no equality in power and glory. As a Son, the Father must be *greater* than He: the genitor is superior to the generated, the giver to the receiver; the sender to the sent. If Jesus thought this exterior equality might be retained, and yet he was willing to part with it, it is the first act of his humiliation: if it was something that belonged to his form which he claimed, it expresses his native dignity. But it ought not to be extended so far as to infringe on the prerogatives of paternity, or to render it inconsistent with the Son's declaration, "The Father is greater than I." The comparison is not between *natures*, but a divine Father, and a divine Son. They cannot be *equal*, and the Father *greater*, in the same respect. The engraved *image* may be so like the *examplar*, that He who knows the one, may know the other also, John xiv. 9. but they cannot be the same. The fountain must be superior to the living stream. Given life, and power, are not unoriginate. If we read it thus, "Christ Jesus who subsisted in the form of God, was therein *equal or like to God without robbery*, but did not covet to retain it, but relinquished it," it shews his humiliation, and benevolence in becoming *poor* for our sakes, who was natively rich, that we through his poverty, might be made rich. His benevolence was not so disinterested but that he expected to be crowned with glory, had respect to the joy set before him, and thought it not mercenary to pray for it when his work was finished. Heb. xii. 2. John xvii. 4. 5.

2. "But made himself of no reputation," or as the translation may be corrected, "Emptied himself, taking upon him the form of a servant in the likeness of men." The word for *emptied* is sometimes translated, *to make void*, or vain. I.

Cor. ix. 15. II. Cor. ix. 3. It denotes his voluntarily diveſting himſelf of his former deiformity, and exterior equality or likeneſs, and being ſubject to vanity, *in the form of a ſervant, in the likeneſs of men.* The *form of* a ſervant is the exterior condition and ſtate of a ſervant. *In the likeneſs of men*, diſtinguiſhes him from angels, who are miniſtring ſpirits to the heirs of ſalvation. This likeneſs is unto his brethren, the children partakers of fleſh and blood. Heb. ii. 14, 17. In his deiformity he was rich, in divine immunities and privileges, of unſervile condition, but for our ſakes became poor, in a menial condition, II. Cor. xiii. 9. in the likeneſs of common men. He became for a little while what he was not before, lower than the angels, and is not now in heaven, and yet he retained, and ſtill retains all his human divine eſſentialities of perſon. Like a King's Son and Heir, who lays aſide the appendages of his native dignity, and becames his Father's ſervant, ſo did He. Iſa. xlii. 6. The form of a ſervant doth not mean the nature of a ſervant, nor doth *likeneſs* imply ſameneſs, or the likeneſs *of men* ſignify the human nature. John ix. 9. God ſent his Son in *the reality of fleſh*, but likeneſs of ſinful fleſh. Rom. viii. 3. His likeneſs to his brethren in all things was *without* ſin.

The ſubject of the incarnation is Chriſt Jeſus, II. John 7. which ſome heretics denied, and the *nature* of it, is his taking part of fleſh and blood, Heb. ii. 14. or becoming fleſh, and coming in fleſh, or aſſuming a body *fitted for him*, Heb. x. 5. which in the Pſalms *is mine ears hath thou opened*, Pſ. xl. 6, alluding to a cuſtom among the Jews, of boring the ear when one who might be, or was free, voluntarily became a ſervant. Exod. xxi. 6. What he aſſumed was not the human, but animal nature, which he had not at his birth; and hath it not now: it was only taken for *a little while*, for *the ſuffering of death*. Heb. ii. 7, 9, 14. In fleſh he *tabernacled* John i. 14. original, among the apoſtles; our earthly houſe of this tabernacle

is a body of flesh and blood, a body subject to hunger thirst, disease, and death. In this the incarnation precisely consisted. The children partakers of flesh and blood, of which Jesus also himself took part, are the offspring of God, the Father of Spirits, not in flesh and blood which constitutes none children; they were children before such participation, and remain so afterwards: In flesh and blood they rank with beasts for the present that God might manifest them: and are subject to vanity, and the bondage of corruption, not willingly, but by him (God) who hath subjected them in hope. I. Rom. viii. 20. To this estate Jesus descended in his incarnation, and was like these children, his brethren as Spirits, and God's offspring, and differed nothing from them in animal respects, only that his flesh was not *sinful*, but the *likeness* of sinful flesh. He became what the first Adam was made, by his incarnation, and is from hence called *man*, and *the Son of man*, though the Lord from heaven; I. Cor. xv. 5. and this is the sole ground of these appellations and not his birth of the Virgin. Not until this time did the days of his flesh commence. In scripture language we are called men, and the Sons of men the Fathers of our flesh with respect to soul and body, as distinguished from the spirit of which God is the sole Father, and in which only we are distinguished from beasts. Jesus stooped to this estate of the sons of men, that as we have been manifested to be beasts, as sons of men, we might also by him be manifested to be the sons of God by the adoption, viz. the redemption or resurrection of the body. There appears to be wisdom in this mystery of godliness as thus imperfectly explained: And that the above account is right for the reason of his name man and the Son of man, is evident in that he is not now man, or the Son of man, nor in the form of a servant in the likeness of men: but one *like to the Son* of man, Rev. i. 13. yet God over all (the Father excepted) blessed forever.

The time of the incarnation of Jeſus Chriſt was after John began his miniſtry, and before he began his own, or tabernacled, among the Apoſtles. John i. 14.

The Apoſtles only are meant by the, *us*, among whom he dwelt after he was made fleſh, even the *we* who beheld his glory. Now it is evident he was not in carnate in the beginning of John's miniſtry; for he was then with God. But he was made fleſh before he came in fleſh, and was manifeſt unto Iſrael. So that juſt before his baptiſm and becoming Chriſt he was made fleſh, and came in fleſh. I. John ix. 2. II. John 7. Rom. viii. 3. And was ſent in the likeneſs of *ſinful* fleſh. As ſome heretics denied the coming of Jeſus Chriſt *in fleſh*, not *the* fleſh, for there is no article before the word for fleſh, the pointing out their error, will help farther to ſhew the nature and the time of the incarnation. The denial of the coming of Jeſus *Chriſt in fleſh*, is equivalent to *denying the Father and the Son*, or *that Jeſus is Chriſt*. I. John ii. 22. None ever denied his birth of the virgin, but the antichriſts denied his after coming in fleſh, and were righter than the reputed orthodox, in ſuppoſing his, incarnation not to be at his birth. Simon Magus and the Gnoſtics were theſe antichriſts, to confute whom John wrote his goſpel. Their error was preciſely this, that the *fleſh* which Jeſus aſſumed in the reign of Tiberius, who had been born thirty years before, in the reign of Auguſtus, was not real, but *fictitious*. They joined *likeneſs* to fleſh, and not *to ſinful*. Rom. viii. 3. Biſhop Pearſon quotes St. Auguſtine, ſaying, "That Simon Magus made himſelf to be Chriſt, and what he feigned of himſelf was attributed by others to Chriſt himſelf." He ſaid, "He gave the law in mount Sinai by Moſes in the perſon of the Father, and that he appeared *putatively*, *feignedly*, in the perſon of the Son in the reign of *Tiberius*." Now it was in the reign of Tiberius that Jeſus began his miniſtry, conſequently the coming of Chriſt in fleſh which he denied was not at

the birth of Jesus. St. Cyril represents Simon as saying, "Jesus Christ appeared not in real flesh but *Dokesi*, in appearance only." Hence they were called *Doketai*, and *Phantasiastai*, as holding that Christ's was not real flesh, and that he suffered in appearance only, putatively, or in phantasmate. Pearson, p. 184. Margin. The scholastic incarnation is of a person neither Jesus nor Christ, but who became both thereby: thus another person is substituted in the room of Jesus Christ, who came in flesh, and was crucified through weakness, and in all was our example, and as that other person is *fictitious*, we have a nothing for the *subject* of their incarnation. And as their incarnation is more than the assumption of flesh, the *nature* of the true incarnation is misrepresented: and so also is the *time*, for it was not at the birth of Jesus, but about thirty years after. This is reputed orthodoxy, and yet no reputed heretics were scarcely ever guilty of three more egregious and fatal errors, and mistakes.

"Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

Here is another word expressive of the exterior state of Christ Jesus, the Schema, fashion of a man, which denotes his figure and shape, in which he suffered hunger, thirst, eat, drank, was seen, handled, and at last died. Being thus found in fashion of an ordinary man, He *humbled* himself to death.

If he had been born mortal, it was his lot, and there could be no room for his humbling himself to death: nor any condescension in submitting to his lot. His birth was no voluntary act of his humility, and if he had been born mortal, there could be no posterior act of humiliation in his dying. In his native state as the Son of God, even though born of a woman, no law subjected him to death, but in the fashion of a man there was a law which obliged him to die. Into this state after leaving the form of God in which he could not die, he voluntarily

entered, and ſo humbled himſelf as to become obedient to the great law of his condition, and though the prince of life died: which death includes his previous ſufferings, and all that was prior to his reſurrection. Death reſpects only the animal part of man: the human nature cannot die naturally. It was the man God's fellow, and not "the great Jehovah that died," and as God the Son in fleſh *purchaſed the church with his own blood*, Acts xx. 28. I. John iii. 16. *and laid down his life for us*. The divine and human life He was born with, he could not part with, but the animal life of man he had aſſumed he could lay down. And as this was his *own* after his aſſumption of it, his whole perſon ſuffered. No man took his life from him, but he died becauſe he choſe to die, and even ſooner than the other malefactors, ſo that Pilate marvelled he was dead ſo ſoon. See the contraſt: the firſt Adam by *ſeeking his own things*, expoſed himſelf and all to loſs: the ſecond Adam by not *pleaſing himſelf*, gained for himſelf glory and honor, and for us more than Adam loſt for himſelf or us. In this He is a pattern for our imitation. "Let the ſame mind be in you, that was alſo in Chriſt Jeſus." The death Chriſt ſuffered was the *death of the croſs*, which with the blood, is conſidered as the propitiation for the ſins of the *whole world*, the price of redemption for all, from the curſe of the law in force againſt them. The ſtanding of all is in redemption, God is not imputing their treſpaſſes to any for not obeying the law, but for not believing in Chriſt. John iii. 36.

3. The next ſtate of Chriſt is that of *exaltation*.

"Therefore God hath highly exalted him," &c.

As the inanition, incarnation, and humiliation made not any eſſential alteration in the conſtitution of his perſon as human divine by its natures: ſo the exaltation added nothing to it, but only changed his *ſtate*. Joſeph was the ſame perſon when in the pit, in the dungeon, and when riding in the

ſecond chariot: ſo was Jeſus when in the manger, when with God, and God, and when in fleſh, and when on the throne of the Divine Majeſty. *Therefore*, may be underſtood *illatively*, or *cauſally*, that his exaltation is either the *ſequel* or *reward of his humiliation*, or both. Luke xxiv. 26. Heb. xii. 2. This is what Chriſt prays for after he had finiſhed his work, "Glorify thou me with thine own ſelf with the glory which I had with thee before the world was:" John xvii. 5. i. e. before thee "who calleth thoſe things which be not as though they were." Rom. iv. 17. This was ſtipulated for in the covenant of redemption, which the father had decreed him, when he was foreordained, and which he was now entitled to; the glory he gave the apoſtles, as the Father gave it to him. And therefore it was no eſſential glory then actually poſſeſſed by him: but the mediatorial glory, he is now exalted to. God hath highly exalted him, or *ſuperexalted*, or *with all exaltation*. It reſpects his whole perſon and not the human nature only, for that cannot but be exalted with the perſon whoſe it is. Exalted above the *grave* in his reſurrection, above the *earth* in his aſcenſion to heaven, and *above all heavens*, at his Father's right hand upon the throne of his glory, to adminiſter all things, and judge the world. Eph. i. 21.

It commenced at his reſurrection, Rom. i. 4. and was a political generation, Pſ. ii. 7. Heb. i. 56. Acts xiii. 32. for a king's coronation day, is his birth day as a king. Then he was veſted with all power in *heaven*, and earth: Matt. xxviii. 18. but before he had all power on *earth as the ſon of man*. Matt. ix. 6. Being brought again into the world at his reſurrection, angels are ordered to *worſhip him*. Heb. xi. 5. Then he became the creator of angels as *thrones, dominions*, principalities and powers, Coloſ. i. 16. 17. and of the world to come, the world for whoſe ſins he is the propitiation. From this time there was a jural poſition of all things under his feet,

Eph. i. 20. and iv. 10. Him alone is excepted which did put all things under him. I. Cor. xv. 27. He is now in *ſtate* God over all, bleſſed forever more: the father of eternal life to his ſeed. Iſa. ix. 6. Heb. ii. 13. *True God* (the ſon) *and eternal life*, as ſome underſtand I. John v. 20. He is in the univerſe what Joſeph was in Egypt, Gen. xli. 40. "Thou ſhalt be over my houſe, and according unto thy word ſhall all my people be ruled, only in the throne will I be greater than thou." His exaltation extends to the utmoſt height of creation, even to divinity of ſtate and condition; which is the dignity and ſummity of the peerleſs ſupereminency, and tranſcendency, or the ſupreme ſupremacy of God. As mere humanity of nature entitles none to an earthly throne, neither doth mere divinity of nature; Joſeph was of the human nature as much in the pit or dungeon, as when riding in the ſecond chariot; but then none were ordered to bow the knee before him. Jeſus was as divine by nature in the manger, and in the days of his fleſh, as he is now: but then none treated him as in ſtate God. To ſuppoſe Jeſus is now ſeated on God's throne, being a creature, is more incongruous, than to imagine Pharaoh advanced an ape or monkey to his throne, and not one of the ſame nature with himſelf, becauſe the difference between the higheſt creature as ſuch, and God, is greater than it is between man, and animal. *The name given Chriſt above every name, is the official dignity of God, added to divinity of nature* which he before poſſeſſed. Thus name ſignifies in nobility learning, ſuch as David his type acquired. II. Sam. vii. 9. Now things are predicable of him that were not true before: for ſince the government hath come upon his ſhoulder, *He is wonderful, &c.* a Prince and a Savior: and is not in the ſtate of a child born or Son given. What the Father was neceſſarily, He is now by the Father's gift, *King of Kings*, Lord of Lords; Alpha and Omega, *Pantocrator, Almighty*, &c

*all imperial;* to Him are aſcribed every perfection in a creature-tranſcendent degree, Rev. v. 12. not upon the account of his eternal Sonſhip, but of his redemption, and as the exalted Lamb. His ſtate is in fine the ſupreme ſupremacy of Godhead: his power is all power, creative, legiſlative, judiciary, and executive. It is therefore reaſonable every knee ſhould bow at or in the name of Jeſus, and every tongue confeſs him Lord to the glory of God the Father: and honor him as they do the Father. John v. 22.

It appears there are two grounds or reaſons of the filiation of Jeſus Chriſt to God.

The firſt is, as Jeſus, whereby he is the Son of God by *nature* the only begotten of the Father. The ſecond is, as Chriſt, whereby he is divine by ſtate. The divinity of the nature of Jeſus can only be proved by his generation, and the communication of the divine life to him therein. But the divinity of the ſtate of Chriſt is to be proved by his official dignity. Thus Chriſt proves his divinity of ſtate from his being ſanctified, *and ſent into the world.* John x. 36. Mr. Emlyn and others who deny the divine nature of the Son, ſay he was only an official God as magiſtrates are. It is allowed divinity of nature is not aſſerted here in John x. 36. however it may be ſuppoſed. As Chriſt he is God by office, but as Jeſus he is God by nature, and it is impoſſible he ſhould be otherwiſe as a Son of a divine Father. Even in the forecited John v. 30, and 38, his divinity of nature is alſo intimated, "I and my father are one," and "the Father is in me and I in him." Sanctity is divinity of nature, or life: and is only the vital ſubſtance, of the intelligent agent made partaker of it: the communication of it to Angels or the regenerate neither makes them all powerful nor all knowing. A nature is no intellect or intellectualiſt, but the ſubſtance of one, and therefore knows nothing of itſelf. Is it a valid proof that a man hath not the human

nature becauſe he knows not ſo much as Newton, or cannot reaſon like a Locke, or write a poem like Milton, or move a weight equal to Samſon or Archimedes? Juſt as well Jeſus may be denied to be divine by nature when in the manger, becauſe he was not that mighty God and great God our Savior he came to be when the government was upon his ſhoulder. Let them prove that the only Begotten of the divine Father can be by nature of a different ſpecies from the Genitor, and it will be to ſome purpoſe. It makes nothing when the Son begins his perſonal exiſtence; his life from the time of its being given, muſt be divine and eternal becauſe the Father's is ſo. A Son can no more be *coeval* with his Father than, a creature can be *coexiſtent* with its creator. The regenerate have now eternal life abiding in them, but were they from eternity? ſcholaſtics ſuppoſe a difference in the *mode of the exiſtence* of the divine being from other beings, and ſpeak of *degrees* of exiſtence: but until they explain themſelves and prove their aſſertions, they muſt ſtand for words without knowledge. One tells us "there are three perſons in one God: not three Gods, for this would be a contradiction: But that this infinite Being exiſts in ſuch a manner as to be three ſubſiſtencies, or perſons, and yet but one God, whom he calls three one, and quotes I. John v. 7." Now all men *live in God*, Acts xvii. 28. as a parental providence. And that all ſaints are in, dwell and abide in God, and are one with him, even as Chriſt and the Father are one, *and are all of one*. John xvii. 22. Heb. ii. 11. But are all theſe diſtinct ſubſiſtencies or perſons, one God? One God or being, cannot have more than one intellect without deſtroying his individuality, and there muſt be one intellect to conſtitute perſonality. To return from this digreſſion, if it be one, Mr. Emlyn and others muſt advance better evidence of Chriſt's not being divine by nature, than his not knowing *the day and hour of* the judgment. Matt. xxiv. 36. Jeſus

had but one intellect, neither his divine nor human nature are capable of knowledge. So that his not knowing that *day or hour*, argues nothing againſt his divine nature, any more than againſt his human nature: nor any thing againſt his divinity of ſtate, for he was then in ſtate man and the Son of man. He knows ſome things now which he hath received the knowledge of ſince. Rev. i. 1, 2. He may know that now, it is no more degrading to him, that the Father gives him his knowledge and power of creation to be in himſelf, than that he gave him his life to be in himſelf. Beſides it is improper for a Father to communicate the arcana imperii, ſecrets of government, to a Son, before he hath inveſted the Son in the government, as was the caſe with Jeſus Chriſt, when he denies that he knew of that day and hour. The prevarication ſome put into the mouth of Jeſus, in whom was no guile, that he did not know it as man, but knew it as God, merits the utmoſt reprobation, as a mean jeſuitical evaſion of their own making, and forging upon him, and nothing but ignorance can be any ſort of excuſe for them, or he hath but one intellect or knowing faculty, or capacity.

Another inferential obſervation may pertinently be made, viz. That *divinity of nature alone*, is no ground of religious worſhip, but divinity of ſtate grounded on and added to divinity of nature is. It is only in his official character Chriſt is worſhipped. Every man poſſeſſes the human nature equally with a king, and yet that nature is no object of civil worſhip, but only the perſon of him who is in ſtate king. While Jeſus was God's holy child and heir, he was truly divine by nature, but direct acts of divine worſhip were not then paid to him.

The worſhip of the wiſe men was *civil* according to the eaſtern mode; it was paid to the born king of the Jews, but it does not appear that they viewed him as divine. The worſhip ordered to be given him is becauſe of his being the ſon

of man, and having all judgment committed to him. John v. 22. As Jesus he was the image of his father's person, but as Christ in his exaltation he is the image of the eternal majesty whom we adore. He that honoreth not the Son in his mission, honoreth not the Father who sent him. The exalted Lamb is worshipped by saints and angels for his state and works. Rev. v. 12. Worship paid Christ only as an official God, would be only such as is civil, and magistrates have a right to, as sons of the Most High. The worshipping the divine nature, doth not determine the personal Being who is the object of it, for the divine nature is partook of by all holy beings in a degree, and yet are not any creatures objects of worship, because not in state divine. The truth is, the divine nature is no personal agent, but the vital substance of one, and it is for the state of a personal agent in this nature that he is worshipped. Should any object that we are to worship God only, and therefore if the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were not in conjunction one God, it would be idolatry to worship the Son. The answer is easy, the worship paid the Son is not *supreme* though it is *divine*, but is such as the divine Father orders to be paid to the divine Son, to His own glory. Phil. ii. 2. The intelligent christian who knows the only true God, and Him whom he hath sent, worships each according to their personal idea and state, and for their personal works, and doth not confound the *sender*, and the sent, and the whole of the worship of Jesus Christ redounds to the glory of the Father, the fountain of all divinity of nature and state.

It is Jesus Christ as exalted, that is the mediatorial creator of all things, as shall be shewn in its place, which determines the nature and time of his creation. That it is spiritual and heavenly, not natural, earthly, or material, and that it did not take place till at or after his resurrection, the beginning of his exaltation.

Jeſus Chriſt in his exaltation is the ſecond perſon in the chriſtian trinity, which is the triune adminiſtration of the kingdom of God.

An eternal Son, and an eternal Trinity, are mere ſcholaſticiſms, human inventions, and groundleſs traditions.

There was no Trinity before the reſurrection of Chriſt, and there will be none after he hath delivered up the kingdom to the Father, and God ſhall be all in all. *Now* the government is that of the Father, of whom are all things, and of the Son, by whom are all things, and of the ſame Spirit, through whom are all things.

The fourth and laſt ſtate of Jeſus Chriſt is what Divines ſay as little of, as they do of the firſt, and with as much confuſion. And although it is not to take place, until the preſent ſtate come to an end it is beſt to deſcribe it here, that the reader may have a connected view of the fourfold ſtates of Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God. The fulleſt account of this laſt ſtate is in I. Cor. xv. 24, 28. The deſign of the apoſtle is to prove the reſurrection of Chriſt, and the conſequential reſurrection of all others, each in their order. Chriſt is to reign in his preſent exalted ſtate, till he hath put down all rule, power, and authority but his own; and put all enemies under his feet, and deſtroyed death the laſt: then cometh the end, and he ſhall deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father: and as the Father who put all things jurally under Chriſt, is excepted from being put under him, ſo when all things ſhall be ſubdued unto Chriſt, then ſhall the Son alſo be ſubject unto him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. The above great events are to take place "*in the times of the reſtitution of all things, which God hath ſpoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets ſince the world began.*" Acts iii. 21. As the Meſſias was to come to reſtore all things, and a reduction, reſtitution, or reſtoration implies that there was an original ſtate of all things to which the reſtoration is to be made, and a preſent derangement of all things:

1. *That original and firſt ſtate of things muſt be deſcribed, that we may determine what things are to be reſtored, and to what degree and extent this reſtoration is to take place.*

The reader muſt take a retroſpect to the ſtate of all things in God's firſt creation and kingdom. For no beings or things will have place in the kingdom of God all in all, but what had a prior exiſtence in the original and firſt creation and kingdom of God: for nothing can be reſtored to what it never was, though the reſtoration may perhaps be to the firſt ſtate with ſome advantage. The original creation of God hath been deſcribed as conſiſting of the matter of all things out of nothing, though the word *create* in no language implies ſo much, becauſe neceſſity of being cannot be attributed to any thing but God. But creation properly is the change of the ſtate and nature of preexiſtent things. Thus the ſtarry and planetary corporeal univerſe was put into order, after a previous creation of the matter of it as a building is fitly framed together. But our earthly ſyſtem was in a chaotic ſtate, and needed a farther adornation, when the firſt creation of God took place, and was not included in it; and therefore nothing in or of the Moſaic creation is to be reſtored to its firſt chaotic ſtate, or the ſtate in which it was placed by the Hexemeron creation.

Beſides the ſtarry and planetary corporeal univerſe, the heaven of beatitude locally underſtood, belonged to that creation, fixed ſomewhere within the region of the planets and fixed ſtars.

And to inhabit theſe celeſtial regions a univerſe of rationals was formed all at once, independent of each other, *ſpirits*, iſſuing from the father of ſpirits, and *holy*, as iſſuing from the fountain of ſanctity, otherwiſe they would have been unfit for ſociety with God, or to be loyal ſubjects of his kingdom. They were under law to God, even the holy ſpiritual moral law, requiring unſinning obedience, which was a covenant of life between God and them, being obeyed in continued life, but could not

give life to tranſgreſſors. In this ſtate all were holy and happy: and God was all in all. There was no ſin or evil, conſequently no mediator, redeemer, renewer or ſanctifier, needed in that ſtate. They were free as moral agents muſt be: but *unconfirmed* in their ſtanding, and therefore fell through abuſe of liberty. The Hebrews mention two orders of theſe rationals, whom they call Cherubim, and Iſchim; ſome of the former the ſame with the angels kept not their firſt eſtate, and all of the latter have left their own habitation and ſtanding in the original kingdom of God. The Iſchim are what we now call human ſouls or Spirits. In Spirits phyſically conſidered there is no ſpecific but gradual difference only. The Moſaic creation and the whole ſtate of things in our world, prove an actual derangement from that firſt ſtate of things. And no things originated by the Moſaic creation are to be reſtored: as they are only terreſtrial and animal.

To effect the reſtitution of all things relating to human ſpirits, the predictive curſe of the ſerpent "that the ſeed of the woman ſhould bruiſe his head," is introductory, next comes the promiſe to Abraham that in him and in his ſeed all nations of the earth ſhould be bleſſed. And after this all the prophecies which ſpeak of the reſtoration of the Jews and others, come in proof of the reſtitution.

When Jeſus Chriſt came in fleſh it was as a common Saviour, he was equally allied to all men, and gave himſelf a ranſom for all alike to be teſtified in due time. All that ever have been, ſince the world began, recovered and reſtored, are indebted to the grace of God through him therefor, as he was foreordained before the foundation of the world, and was the Lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world, for this purpoſe: and all that are ever reſtored in future, muſt own that their ranſom, even if it be from the *pit*, is by the blood of the covenant, or by Jeſus Chriſt as ſlain for us.

There is a jural reſtitution of all things already accompliſhed in conſequence of what Chriſt hath already done, by the Father's committing all things into Chriſt's hands, putting all things in ſubjection under his feet, ſo as to leave nothing that is not put under him. Heb. ii. 8.

In this ſenſe he hath reconciled all things, in heaven and earth, and created all things anew, a general peace, a new world, and kingdom of God, a new teſtament covenant and law, "old things are paſſed away, behold all things are become new."

But the *actual* reſtitution of all things is not yet accompliſhed, "We ſee not yet all things put under Chriſt, but we ſee Jeſus, who was made lower than the angels *for a little while*, for the ſuffering of death, crowned with glory and honor" to effect it. Heb. ii. 9. original. And we expreſsly read that he muſt reign till all enemies are put under him, and death itſelf the laſt is deſtroyed. He was manifeſted to deſtroy the works of the devil: ſhall he not do it? Nay he became incarnate that he might deſtroy the devil himſelf, and he will do it. The devil and his adherents as *ſuch* are not of God's creation, they had no exiſtence in God's original creation and kingdom, nor will they have any being in God's final kingdom. God will not ſuffer an eternal blemiſh in his works, or evil to be endleſs. He cannot be relatively all in all until all evil and evil beings as ſuch, and every plant not of God's planting, are deſtroyed and rooted out. God being love without hatred, gave only beneficial being to rationals; their chief end is to glorify God and enjoy him forever. He wills their ſalvation in the way of holineſs, through coming to the knowledge of the truth: who ſhall effectually fruſtrate this end? can it be done by any creatures? they who think it can entertain very unworthy apprehenſions of the Almighty, and ſo do they who ſuppoſe he deſigned any for endleſs miſery in

giving them being. That this was neceſſary for God's glory, or for the good of the whole, is utterly abſurd. The being, deſigned for endleſs miſery in his production, can be under no obligation to his creator, conſequently cannot ſin, which is a violation of obligation. The good of no whole can conſiſt in the miſery of the individuals that compoſe it. And that the glory of God, or the happineſs of the righteous, ſhould be promoted by the endleſs miſery of ſome, is utterly inadmiſſible, as repugnant to their natures and benevolent characters. The happy themſelves delight in the happineſs of others, and not in their miſery, and the benevolent will promote it all in their power. There is in all rationals ſomething that was in God, which he has not by their defection loſt his propriety in, and he has not relinquiſhed his right to it. They were once holy and happy, and will be reſtored again to their primitive ſtate, that God may be all in all to them, which he is not at preſent, but will be at the end of Chriſt's mediatorial reign. Chriſt is ſaid to be "all and in all." Coloſ. iii. 11. He is all in himſelf as mediator; *and in all* the redeemed in a meaſure. But he is in none *all in all*, without any interpoſing *and*. So far as he is *all and in all* to any, there is ſome detraction from the Father, ſo that he is not all in all as he will be when the all power given to the Son is reſtored to him that gave it. God gave Chriſt to be "Head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulneſs of him that filleth all in all." Eph. i. 22, 23. But here a preſent deficiency is implied as the filling is not completed, and *to be* all in all is ſomething more than to *fill* all in all, and this is alſo a kind of detention from the Father of that which he was originally, and is to be finally. As in the multitude of people is the king's honor: but in the want of people is the deſtruction of the prince. Prov. xiv. 28: ſo God's relative all in allſhip is detracted from him while any of his ſubjects continue unholy and rebel-

lious. The reſtitution of all to God and heaven will be in a way conſiſtent with all the divine perfections; he is a juſt God and a Savior. All will be his willing people in the day of his power, and ſome will be ſaved *ſo as by fire.*

When the Son delivers up the kingdom, and is himſelf ſubject to the Father, he will retire from government, and return to the ſtate and form of God he was in before his incarnation, full of all the ſatisfaction, and with all the honor and glory reſulting from his beneficial work. He will be as glorious in giving *up* as in receiving the kingdom.

The advocates for endleſs ſin and miſery ſtill continue God's creation and kingdom divided and deranged: God is not and never can be all in all, according to them, to the whole of it. He endures in his creation what is not of his making, and what his ſoul hates and abhors. A uſurping devil is paramount to him in the number of his ſubjects. Some of them ſay Chriſt died only for a few, but all for whom he died will be ſaved. Others ſay he died for all, and yet finally will loſe moſt of his redeemed. But neither of them can give a ſatisfactory reaſon for the endleſs duration of ſin and miſery, nor reconcile it to the benevolence, holineſs, wiſdom, and even juſtice of God. Endleſs puniſhment cannot be proved to be conducive to God's glory, or the benefit of the righteous, who are perfected by love and not by fear, and confirmed in their happy condition without need of ſuch a ſpectacle of miſery always before them, who as iſſuing from God they are always, and ever will be bound to love.

What hath cauſed many to deny the ſalvation of all men is their ſuppoſing the general judgment *ends* the mediator's reign and that this life, be it longer or ſhorter, is the only time of mercy to the ſpirits and ſouls God hath made. But theſe are ſhewn to be miſtakes by many able writers on this ſubject, and to theſe the reader is referred.

In the kingdom of God *all in all*, all communications are immediately from God as the fountain to every ſtream: and he communicates *himſelf*, to the utmoſt finite beings are capable of receiving. All are *filled with all the fulneſs of God*. Eph. iii. 19. And this is their permanent and immutable condition. Into this kingdom of God all in all, the mediatorial kingdom empties itſelf, as into a vaſt ocean, and becomes *ended*, as to its mode of adminiſtration. God's kingdom will come under his ſole perſonal government. The economies that have been, or now are, do in a meaſure detract from, or eclipſe, the glory, dominion, and eternal ſovereignty of the one God. The law was the word ſpoken by angels; and even the goſpel though to the glory of the one God the Father, and the Father himſelf is exempted from the all things put under Chriſt, yet being the kingdom of the Son, a human divine perſon, it muſt give way to this eternal kingdom. The kingdom of the mediator ſhall have no end in its *effects*, yet it muſt have an end in its *adminiſtration*. Being the kingdom of the Son properly, it ſhall laſt until He is fully *glorified*, and then the appropriate kingdom of the Father ſhall come in abſolute eternity. The whole of creation, the beauties of providence, and the grace of redemption ſhall then be ſeen in the majeſty of the Father, the ſource and end of all. The whole ſtate of rule, power, and authority, ſhall be taken away by Chriſt from all creatures, and be delivered up by him to the Father, from whence all originated, and He alone ſhall be all in all, to his Son, and the redeemed forever. What the Son then ſhall be depends upon what He was before the mediatorial undertaking. He was God with God, and ſubſiſted in the form of God, and therefore will not be in the rank of a general to execute an important commiſſion and then return into the rank of fellow ſubjects: but will remain the divine Son of a divine Father, and enjoy all the glory and felicity of his atchievements, and the ſatisfaction of

ſeeing all his redeemed ſafe and happy forever. The preſent reign of Chriſt is for the ſubduing of every oppoſing power, Jews, Romans, Turks, Kings, and Infidels, Sin, Death and the Devil. Then every branch of his mediatorial office ſhall ceaſe. The prophetic with all need of inſtruction will be ſucceeded by the beatifical viſion, and perfection of knowledge: preſent fruition will prevent *oblation*, and interceſſion, and *perfect ſecurity* in life eternal, will prevent all need of *rule* and *protection*. But the real glory of Chriſt, and the ſaved, will not be diminiſhed but rather enhanced. The end of all diſpenſations hath been to manifeſt God to his creatures; all that ever hath been, ſhall be, or can be, is to be found in God: therefore whatever hath been in all the economies of time, ſhall be ſeen in this infinite mirror, with all the glorious attributes of wiſdom, juſtice, power, grace, holineſs, &c. clearly ſhining out in them, and fully underſtood, ſhall be viſible in the glorious fountain of all. Whatever perfections the mind of any creature can or ſhall have any apprehenſions of, are in God. And none can have ſo high conceptions of God in the kingdom of Chriſt, as they will in the kingdom of God, all in all: for they will ſee him as He is.

Now they know the exemplar by the image, but then God will manifeſt himſelf directly and fully, and they will be fortified to bear it. God being infinite, the infinity of glory which he is, cannot indeed be taken in at once by finite beings: therefore there will be eternal new and freſh glories and pleaſures without ſatiety, breaking in upon the whole ſtate of angels and Saints. A river of life, and pleaſure ever flowing always freſh and new. All have *all* ſo far as finite beings can, and yet *new*, becauſe they cannot have all at once. The greatneſs of this kingdom is inconceivable as it draws up into its vortex all rationals of God's creation, as they all iſſued from the Father of ſpirits, and the fountain of ſanctity, ſo they will

be brought home in him. And *there* will abide as in their eternal manſion. Then Chriſt perſonally will be more glorious upon delivering up the kingdom than upon his reception of it. The above fourfold ſtates belong to Jeſus Chriſt, and not to any eternal Son, or Logos, nor to any mere nature which is no agent, but like a cypher without an integer, of no denomination, ſeparate from its ſubject.

## CHAP. VII.

*Of the perſonal name Jeſus: His office as Chriſt: Dignity as the One Lord: A creator under this character: His creation a proof of his divinity of ſtate and nature.*

THE contents of this chapter are included in the words of the Apoſtle, "One Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by Him." I. Cor. viii. 6. As the Father is the *one God*, in *oppoſition* to the gods many, and in *diſtinction* from the Son: ſo Jeſus Chriſt is the one Lord in *oppoſition* to the lords many, and in *diſtinction* from the Father. For though the Father is Lord, and Chriſt is God, yet the ſupremacy belongs to the Father in both titles, as appears from the addition, "of whom are all things," which is ſomething more than, "by whom are all things," applied to the Son. Mr. Pool's continuators quote a learned author as ſaying, "That although the name God is often given to the Son, yet no where by St. Paul, when he makes mention of God the Father: from hence he concludes the preeminence of the Father to Chriſt, and the Son's preeminence to all others, the Father alone excepted, according to I. Cor. xv. 27." It may be added that although the Father is Lord, and the Son is alſo Lord, yet not

in the ſame ſupreme ſenſe. Both are not one God, nor both one Lord in any ſenſe, nor God and Lord in the ſame ſenſe, though both are tranſcendent to creatures.

1. Jeſus is the perſonal name of the Holy Thing whoſe generation, nativity, &c. hath been deſcribed, given him at his circumciſion, as had been ordered by the angel before his birth. It was a common name among the Jews, and like others ſignificant, eſpecially when given by divine command. Among all the perſonal types of Jeſus, Oſhea the ſon of Nun, was moſt eminent in his names and works.

Moſes calls him Jehoſhua, or Joſhua; and as Oſhea ſignifies ſalvation, or the deſire of it, ſo Joſhua ſignifies the certain futurition of ſalvation by the perſon ſo named. Thus much the angel expreſſeth, "He himſelf ſhall ſave his people from their ſins." Luke i. 31. This name is equivalent to Emmanuel by prefixing Jah to Oſhea, which is God the Savior is with us. Matt. i. 22.

But Jeſus was not born a Savior in actual office, but was made Chriſt the Lord, and exalted to be a Prince and a Savior.

2. Chriſt is an official name added to Jeſus, and is the ſame with Meſſiah in Hebrew, and anointed in Engliſh.

Jeſus was made Chriſt as a man is made an officer, and this was at his baptiſm by John. Time was when Jeſus was not Chriſt, to ſuppoſe a Chriſt before Jeſus is abſurd, becauſe it places the office before the perſon. Milton and others who ſpeak of the Meſſiah's acting as chief general of the eternal king againſt Satan, know not what they ſay. Chriſt was the object of the divine foreordination before the foundation of the world, but this came not to paſs until almoſt thirty years after the birth of Jeſus. When a perſon was made Chriſt he was ſet apart to ſome ſpecial office, which is a political creation, or making of him. Prophets, Prieſts, and Kings, were ſo many Chriſts: but one was expected who was to be above his

fellows. Heb. i. 9. John iv. 25. This expectation prevailed among the Jews, Samaritans, and other nations, as several learned writers have proved. When the trees made them a king, they *chrifted* him, inveſted him in office. Jud. ix. 8. The King's prophets and prieſts were made chriſts by unction. As the Judaical economy was typical of the chriſtian, and its government conſiſted of theſe three offices, ſo Jeſus as Chriſt ſuſtains them all.

His unction to the *prophetic* office is predicted in the Old Teſtament and fulfilled in the new. Iſa. lxi. 1. Luke iv. 21. Acts iii. 22. And in his *preparation*, *actual miſſion*, and *execution* of this office, He was ſuperior to all prophets. While with God he received his inſtructions from his Father, and was taught what to ſay, and teſtify. John iii. 32. He was *ſanctified*, ſet apart to his work, *ſealed*, commiſſioned to engage in it, and actually *ſent* to execute it. His inauguration was at his baptiſm when he was anointed with the Holy Ghoſt. In the execution of his office, he *declared* the Father, as *having been in his boſom*, John i. 17. of his boſom council; therefore is he called the Word, and his very enemies owned no man ſpake like him, and his friends, that he had the words of eternal life. And his works bare witneſs that the Father ſent him. John xviii. 37.

As Chriſt, Jeſus ſuſtained the *prieſtly office*, not after the order of Aaron, for he was of Judah, but of a more ancient order, even that of the firſt born. Yet what Aaron did in his office was typical of what Chriſt was to do in his, by way of *oblation*, *interceſſion* and *benediction*.

In way of *oblation*, he had ſomewhat to offer, *as a body was fitted for him*. Heb. x. 5. viii. 3. And he became a conſecrated, everlaſting, and royal high prieſt after the order of Melchiſedeck when he aſcended up on high.

Scholaſtics have written much concerning the infinite evil of ſin, and the neceſſity of an infinite atonement. Some have

thought that the penalty of Adam's ſin, was death temporal, ſpiritual and eternal; and one thinks it was death eternal only. Whatever his puniſhment was, He and all his deſcendants ſuffer it in its full extent, and Chriſt frees none from it. That Chriſt ſuffered death ſpiritual and eternal, ſcholaſtics will find it difficult to prove. Chriſt was put to death in fleſh, and becauſe the aſſumed body of fleſh was his *own*, He laid down his life for us, and as God manifeſt in fleſh, purchaſed the church with his own blood. It was the perſon of Jeſus that ſuffered, and not one or more natures: and His dignity, and the Father's appointment and acceptance of him therein, rendered it available to atone for all ſins. Though in Adam all die without exception, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive. But not as was the offence ſo alſo is the free gift: for the life by Chriſt is eternal. I. Cor. xv. 22. Rom. v. 15. Thus the infinite evil of ſin, and its infinite atonement, become infinitely intelligible to a *finite* capacity.

As a prieſt Jeſus Chriſt ever lives to intercede for us, and upon this foundation is built our perſuaſion of his ability to ſave to the uttermoſt the comers to God by him. Heb. viii. 25.

The laſt branch of the prieſt's office is benediction. I. Chron. xxiii. 13. Gen. xiv. 19. The only ſacerdotal act of Melchiſedeck upon record is, his bleſſing God, and Abraham. The Jews ſay the prieſts bleſſed the people in the *morning*, but not in the *evening*, to ſignify that in the evening of the world, the benediction of the law ſhould ceaſe, and the benediction of the Meſſiah ſucceed it. This may be intimated by the dumbneſs of Zechariah the father of John Baptiſt, Chriſt's forerunner.

Chriſt began his ſermon on the Mount with *bleſſed*; at leaving the world he *bleſſed* his diſciples. But at his conſecration, "God having raiſed up his Son Jeſus, ſent him to bleſs us, in turning every one from their iniquities." Acts iii. 26.

No man taketh the honor of the prieſthood upon himſelf, but he that is called of God as was Aaron: Chriſt glorified not himſelf to be made an high prieſt, but he that ſaid unto him, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Heb. x. 4, 5. This was at his reſurrection from the dead.

Jeſus as Chriſt is the anointed king on the holy hill of Zion. Daniel prophetically calls him "Meſſiah the Prince." In the ſecond Pſalm he is called *King*. Gabriel told his Mother that the Lord God would give him the *throne* of his Father David. Chriſt witneſſed this good confeſſion before Pontius Pilate, that he was a King. And He ſuffered under this inſcription, "Jeſus of Nazareth, King of the Jews." But every one knows that no perſon is born a king from a king plenarily: there muſt be an after actual inveſtiture.

Under the law a particular *oil* and *manner of anointing*, were preſcribed. The pouring the oil, which might not be imitated on the deſignated perſon, by one duly authorized, was eſteemed an unction, and that unction an inauguration. The ancient oil the Jews ſuppoſe to have been loſt in Joſiah's time, and the cuſtom of anointing in that manner hath from hence ceaſed. But Jeſus is conſidered as anointed with the oil of gladneſs, with the antitype of the ancient oil, even the Holy Ghoſt, Pſ. xlv. 7. Acts x. 38. who deſcended upon him at his baptiſm. He was anointed with regal *power* at his reſurrection. Then He had on his veſture and on his thigh a name written, "King of Kings, and Lord of Lords." Rev. xix. 13. As a king he hath a creative, legiſlative, judiciary, and executive power. The effuſion or action of the ſpirit deſcending upon him, ſignified the divine election to his office, and an influx to fit him for it.

According to ancient practice *waſhing* preceded unction, therefore anointing was often performed near ſome fountain. Solomon was ſent to Gihon, and Jeſus went to Jordan to be

baptized and anointed by the deſcent of the Spirit upon him like a dove. Then he was conſtituted Chriſt in actual office. His unction denoted his dignity, and ſacredneſs as the holy one of God, every way qualified for his work.

Since Jeſus was made Chriſt at his baptiſm, and King at his reſurrection, it follows that there was no Chriſt before, only in the divine foreordination which precludes actual being. As to I. Cor. x. 9. "Neither let us tempt Chriſt, as ſome of them alſo tempted," it is not him, Chriſt, but God whom they ſpake againſt, even the Moſt High. Numb. xxi. 5. 6. Pſ. lxxviii. 56. As to Moſes's eſteeming the reproach of Chriſt greater riches than the treaſures of Egypt, it only proves him to have been a believer in Chriſt to come, and that the reproaches of the godly then, are the ſame with the reproaches of chriſtians now. Heb. xi. 26. The Spirit in the ancient prophets, is called the *Spirit of Chriſt*, becauſe he predicted his coming, ſuffering, and glory. I. Pet. i. 11. That any one ſhould exiſt officially, before he exiſted perſonally, is abſurd. As to *his glory*, John xii. 41. it is not predicated of Chriſt, but of him whom Iſaiah ſaw, which was the Father, who predicted the blinding and hardening of the Jews under the Miniſtry of Chriſt when he ſhould come. Iſai. xi. 1. That Chriſt was the angel of God's preſence; or that God ever ſpake by him in times paſt, or that the law was given by him, are ſuppoſitions without proof, and againſt proof. Heb. i. 2. ii. 2. 3. As to his being called the *meſſenger of the covenant*, Mal. iii. 1. it is not as then come, but to come in future." St. Peter fully determines that Chriſt did not preexiſt the birth of Jeſus, when he ſaith, "Let all the houſe of Iſrael know aſſuredly, that God hath *made* that ſame Jeſus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord, and Chriſt." Acts ii. 36. He could not be made what he was before.

*Jeſus Chriſt is the one Lord by whom are all things, and we by Him.*

Although Jeſus is ſaid to be "born Chriſt the Lord," He was not then Chriſt or Lord actually and officially, but only *deſignedly*, for he was made both Lord and Chriſt afterwards. His being the one Lord *by whom are all things*, diſtinguiſhes him *from the one God, or the one Jehovah of whom are all things*. The title of Lord, both in the old teſtament and new, hath relation to dominion: and in a civil law ſenſe it denotes a ſuperior proprietor of things and perſons; Matt. xx. 8. and in one place it is only a title of civil reſpect tranſlated *Sir*. John v. 7. In nobility learning, which treateth of titles of honor, the greater dominant eſtates of a kingdom are Lords. I. Sam. v. 2. Of the Lords many, Chriſt is the Lord paramount. In ſcripture the title of Lord is applied to God the Father, as anſwering to El, Eloah, Elohim, Adon, Jehovah, Kurios, Deſpotes: and as ſome of theſe are applied to Chriſt, ſome have wrongly inferred him to be the one Jehovah, or one with him. The Jews tell many wonders about the incommunicableneſs of the name Jehovah: but it is applied to other perſons, and even to Jeruſalem, as the woman is called after her huſband. Jerem. xxxiii. 16.

It is evident Chriſt is prophetically called Jehovah our righteouſneſs: Jerem. xxiii. 5. and ſome think two Jehovahs are mentioned in another place. Zech. x. 12. But to infer from hence that Chriſt is in any ſenſe the ſupreme Jehovah is very wrong. Dr. Whitby on I. Cor. viii. 6. argues thus, "That becauſe Chriſt's being the one Lord, doth not exclude the Father from being the one Lord, therefore the Father's being the one God, doth not exclude the Son from being God alſo." But this is far from being concluſive, becauſe the Father and Chriſt are not the one Lord in the ſame ſenſe, for *the of whom are all things*, will in no ſenſe apply to Chriſt, nor *the by whom are all things*, to the Father. The Lordſhip of Chriſt is not neceſſary, original, ſupreme, and underived, as that of the

Father's is. Jehovah calls Chriſt Adon or Adonai as diſtinguiſhed from himſelf: Pſ. cx. 1. and the Son hath a God even when called God. Heb. 1. 8, 9. The Lordſhip of the Father is founded on the original, and terreſtrial creation, but Chriſt is a mediatorial Lord, and his dominion is founded on a creation, like his kingdom, *not of this world.*" Jeſus Chriſt both died, roſe and revived, that he might be Lord of the dead and living." The Father is the only Lord God in the ſupreme ſenſe. Jude 4. The dominion of Chriſt is delegated, but not to a creature: the extent of it is univerſal, the Father alone excepted. Acts. x. 36. I. Cor. xv. 27. His dominion is like to Joſeph's over Egypt, an eminent type of him. "Thou ſhalt be over my houſe, and according to thy word ſhall all my people be ruled, only in the throne will I be greater than thou." Gen. xli. 40. Two ſupremes upon one throne is a contradiction in terms, and two equals in authority is a repugnance to all government. But to infer from hence that Chriſt is a creature Lord, would be no better than to deny Joſeph's humanity of nature, when Pharaoh advanced him to ride in the ſecond chariot.

In *heaven* this one Lord is above all thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers, who are conſtituted by him what they now are, and they are commanded to worſhip him. He is exalted far above all heavens, which are the utmoſt height of created nature: and hath a name above every name which is that of God, in an actual ſtate of reigning.

On *earth* his dominion is over all, the heathen are his, and all mankind are put in ſubjection to him: Lord of lords, King of kings, Prince of the kings of the earth, he is anointed above his *fellows*, who are anointed ones.

Human dominion is acquired by *purchaſe*, *conqueſt*, or voluntary conſent: Chriſts dominion is by an acquired right: as other Lords had uſurped dominion over men, not without their conſent: Chriſt delivered us by conquering them who held us

in ſervitude: and bought, or redeemed us by paying a price, not to the uſurpers, but to God, by which means he hath acquired a right of dominion over us and propriety in us. He doth not make us ſlaves, but treats us as freemen, and requires our voluntary conſent to become his people. His dominion over holy angels is not by conqueſt or purchaſe, but by reconciliation, recapitulation, recreating them as thrones, &c. and confirming them in their preſent ſtanding. Coloſ. i. 20. Eph. i. 10. Coloſ. i. 16. Heb. i. 6. Thus angels and men have one and the ſame Lord, and even devils are ſubject to his powerful dominion.

This ſtate of Chriſt as the one Lord, is imported by that title, "The firſt born of every creature;" Coloſ. i. 15. it hath no relation to paſt time, being in the preſent tenſe, and expreſſes the preſent dignity of Jeſus Chriſt, and not of any eternal Son born before the creation. But more of this in its place. The dignity and condition of Chriſt as the one Lord, is his *divinity of ſtate, or creature-tranſcendency of rank and office*: and ſuppoſes his divinity of nature on which it is grounded. The prime duty of chriſtians is to confeſs him Lord. Rom. xiv. 7, 8.

There is a certain work predicated of Jeſus Chriſt as the one Lord, in thoſe words, "By whom are all things, and we by him."

The all things here intended are only ſpiritual bleſſings in heavenly places: no other are correſpondent to the character of Jeſus Chriſt, nor is he the author of any other, but ſuch as are ſpiritual and chriſtian in their kind and quality. Theſe are the all things God *hath made by Jeſus Chriſt, the beginning of the creation of God.* Rev. iii. 14. That the chriſtian religion is the conſtitution of all things conſtitutively made, and executively introduced, appears from its names: the religion of ſaving grace; the law of grace, faith, and liberty; the New

Teſtament, covenant, and law; the kingdom of God and heaven, not come until our Savior's reſurrection; the world to come put in ſubjection to Chriſt; and from the character of God as the Savior and of Chriſt the Prince and Savior; from the chriſtian Trinity who are the perſonal ſovereignty in this kingdom; from the church's being called one new man, conſiſting of Jews and Gentiles, and the New Jeruſalem; and laſtly, from chriſtians being new creatures in or by Chriſt. If all this doth not imply a new creation both political and real, then effects may exiſt without a productive cauſe. Theſe are the all things which are of God as the Father, by the one Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

The prophets predict a new creation and ſtate of things to come in the days of the Meſſiah. Iſa. lxv. 17, 18. *New heavens and new earth,* in prophetic language, ſignify a new politic conſtitution of things: and to create a city, is to form a body politic, by declaring its rights, and eſtabliſhing its conſtitution. An incorporating act is creative. Iſa. lxvi. 22. Theſe new heavens and earth are called *worlds*, as including the angelic and human ſyſtems; Heb. i. 4. the ſame with the all things in heaven and on earth created; Coloſ. i. 16. and the ſame with the world to come put in ſubjection to Chriſt. Heb. ii. 5. Or *worlds* may be tranſlated the ages, the ſeveral economies, and diſpenſations, that have or are to take place before the end come. Could a world come without a creation of it? or new heavens and new earth, or new any thing without a new creation? God, as the prime cauſe, makes all things new, Rev. xxi. 5. And the prophecies relating to this event point to the *laſt or latter* days, not of the world, but of the Jewiſh polity, the world preceding the world to come, Gen. xlix. 1. Num. xxiv. 14. Acts ii. 17. I. John ii. 18. Heb. i. 2. which extend no farther than to the deſtruction of the Jewiſh ſtate, and worldly ſanctuary. There was a *jural* or *conſtituitive* mak-

ing all things new, at our Savior's reſurrection: but old things did not wholly paſs away, until the call of the Gentiles, the taking of Jeruſalem, and burning of the temple. Then ſome ſuppoſe the coming of the New Jeruſalem from God out of heaven, took place. Rev. xxi. 1, 2.

The ruin of the Jews' commonwealth, and their worldly elements, is in prophetic language, ſet forth as if the whole world were come to an end. Deut. xxxii. 22, 23. Jer. iv. 23. 27. Matt. xxiv. 29, 34. Rev. vi. 12, 13. Theſe great events were repreſented by the earthquake when Chriſt aroſe, even the removal of things ſhaken, to make way for the things that could not be ſhaken. Hag. ii. 6. comp. Heb. xii. 27.

The creation by Chriſt is both political and real, changing the *nature* and *ſtate* of things, which is the proper notion of a ſcripture creation. Then a new divine ſettlement of things was made. Peace was created.

The kingdom of God of *original*, became *mediatorial*, by a new conſtitution and law, a new declaration of rights and dues, a new ſovereignty, the chriſtian trinity, new creatures and ſubjects. Creating and building are ſynonymous, the building a houſe, is not the making the materials out of nothing, but the framing, ordering and putting them together. God's church is his houſe, temple, building, made by Chriſt as a Son over his own houſe. I. Cor. iii. 9. Heb. iii. 6. Zech. xi. 12. This is the city the patriarchs looked for as to come, and is now come, whoſe builder and maker is God by Jeſus Chriſt. There is a ſettlement by creation of rights and dues, on which politic ſocieties are founded, and whereby they are compacted and held together. God became a creator of Iſrael as a people, when he redeemed and eſtabliſhed them, as he had before created them as men, which is a foundation for his plural name *creators*, Eccl. xii. 1. original. if that is not purely idiomatical. And in like manner he made us men, and creates us new creatures

by Chriſt. Theſe are the things which are of the one God the Father, by the one Lord Jeſus Chriſt; He as a Son, Mediator, Redeemer, Savior, the appointed Heir of all things, is the creator, which determines the kind of his creation.

The Lord God, the Father of the holy child Jeſus, whom he hath anointed, is the creator of the material ſyſtem, heaven and earth, the ſea, and all that in them is. Acts iv. 24, 27. If the reader runs over the ſeveral places in the New Teſtament which ſpeak of the creation of Jeſus Chriſt, he will perceive what the all things are by him. "By the Word which was God were all things made; and without him was not any thing made that was made." This Word which was God, St. John ſaith was the only begotten of the Father, and the only begotten is Jeſus Chriſt, and no other. John i. 3, 14, 17. The character of John as an evangelical hiſtorian, the epoch of his hiſtory as explained by himſelf and others, and the ſubject of whom he predicates theſe things, no eternal Logos, or Son, which never did exiſt but in a ſcholaſtic's mind ſpoiled through philoſophy: all determine the creation to be of ſpiritual and heavenly, and not of material, and terreſtrial things. And leſt any ſhould underſtand theſe all things to be of this world: he ſaith "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not." How he was in the world, Chriſt repeatedly tells us, and what world it was, and when he came into it, even in his miniſtry. John xvi. 28. And as to the world made by him, it could not be the material world he came into, or was in, becauſe he made one world after he was in another. The world He made therefore muſt be that *world* which God ſo loved as to give his Son to be a propitiation for its ſins, and which *world* God is reconciling to himſelf in Chriſt. The *world that knew him not*, is the unbelieving world lying in wickedneſs: for *He even came to his own*, and they received him not. If he created this world,

we read of no ſaint or angel in ſcripture that ever knew it or worſhipped him for it: a fact ſo ſtrange and yet true, that ſcholaſtics know not how to account for it. The angelic, but eſpecially, the *whole* human world, receive benefit from Chriſt as he hath confirmed the former, and is the propitiation for the ſins of the latter, and is a new creator, as reconciler and redeemer. The above expoſition will appear the plainer if one error John wrote to oppoſe is conſidered, viz. the denial of the coming of Jeſus Chriſt in fleſh. I. John iv. 2. and II. John 7. This error was not that Jeſus was born of the virgin, but that at, or before his being made Chriſt, at his baptiſm, he was made fleſh, came in fleſh, and was God manifeſt in fleſh. St. John therefore begins with affirming that the perſon then well known by the name of the Word, to be the only begotten of the Father, who was Jeſus Chriſt, had a real exiſtence with God, in the beginning of the *goſpel epoch*, and was God. Here he ſubjoins an eulogy of him, and ſpeaks of his work which would better come in, in this place, than afterwards to the interruption of his narration. *Read* what follows relative to his creation, his being the life, and light of men, his coming to his own, and their receiving him not, and believers receiving him, &c. in a parentheſis, and all will be eaſy. Thus in the beginning of the goſpel æra, the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. This I repeat for the greater confirmation. The ſame was in the beginning with God. In this time there was a man ſent from God, whoſe name was John, to bear witneſs of the *light, the Word*, ſo called, becauſe of the light he is in himſelf and religion to men, as he is called the Word becauſe of his declaring the Father, and having the words of eternal life. The above Word was made or became fleſh, and dwelt or tabernacled among *us, apoſtles*, full of grace and truth. And *we* beheld his glory, as the glory of the only *begotten* of the Father. As the above perſon whom I have

called the Word, God, Life, Light, really and truly was: and of his fulneſs of grace and truth, we have all received, and grace for grace: for the law was given by Moſes, but grace and truth came by Jeſus Chriſt, the perſon I have been writing of, under the above metaphors. No man hath ſeen God at any time: (He that is of God hath ſeen the Father, and is therefore an exception) the only begotten Son, which was in the boſom of the Father (of his boſom council) hath declared him.

The words of St. Paul will confirm the above idea of Chriſt's creation. He was ſent to "preach among the Gentiles the unſearchable riches of Chriſt: and to make all men ſee, what is the fellowſhip of the myſtery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, *who created all things by Jeſus Chriſt.*" Eph. iii. 8, 9. God created all things by *Jeſus Chriſt*, not by any eternal Son, or Logos, and the all things created relate to the myſtery which had been hid in God from the beginning of the world: therefore it muſt be an evangelical creation, and the all things muſt be of the chriſtian *kind*, not material, terreſtrial, animal or natural, but *ſpiritual* and *heavenly*.

In Coloſ. i. 15, 16, 17, there is a large account of the dignity of Chriſt in his now exalted ſtate, "As the image of the inviſible God, the firſt born of every creature," He gives this reaſon, "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, viſible and inviſible, whether they be thrones, dominions, principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt. And he is the head of the body the church, who is the beginning, the firſt born from the dead, that in all things he might have the preeminence." All this is predicted of Jeſus Chriſt and not of any eternal Son or Logos, even "Him in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveneſs of ſins." The whole

*is* in the preſent, not paſt time, who *is* the image ; the firſt born : *who is*, not who was, before all things, &c. Proto tokas rendered, firſt born, hath no relation to priority in time, but is only expreſſive of preſent dignity. In ſcripture language the firſt born is the Heir and Lord. So it ſignifies among other nations beſides the Jews. The firſt born of every creature is the ſame with the *Lord of all*, or *the Heir of all things*, to which Chriſt was *appointed* in his exaltation ſtate. Acts x. 36. Heb. i. 1. When God ſaid to David, a type of Chriſt, "I will make him firſt born," it is thus explained, "Higher than the kings of the earth." This was true of David when he conquered the neighboring kings. Pſ. lxxxix. 27. II. Sam. viii. 6, 12. and xi. 19. All of them might be older men, and older kings than he, and yet he be firſt born, becauſe higher than they : and of Chriſt when he was exalted to the throne of God. The conſequent reaſon given proves this to be the ſenſe. "For by him were all things created," &c. The creator muſt be higher than the created. Theſe all things are the ſame that are reconciled, and gathered together in one. Coloſ. i. 20. Eph. i. 10. Dr. Whitby ſaith "ſpiritual things are not intended, becauſe things viſible and on earth are not capable of a moral creation : he ſuppoſes the things made and ſeen in the Moſaic creation are the ſame with theſe viſible things of Chriſt's creation, which compriſeth all things without life, as metals, ſtones, vegetables, beaſts and trees." If Jeſus Chriſt is creator of theſe, they are ſpecifically ſpiritual, holy, and heavenly, as all his products are. There are viſible things of Chriſt's creation, both politically and really conſidered. The kingdom of God among men, the New Teſtament covenant and law, new inſtitutions and ordinances, new ſacraments, a new day, new paſtors, a new man the church, and new creatures, are viſibles, and not "metals, ſtones, beaſts, vegetables, and trees."

The *invisibles* are in heaven as thrones, &c. These Dr. Whitby supposes, against Grotius, to be incapable of renovation, or a new creation by Christ. But it is only a theopolitical creation that is here asserted, and not any creation of the angels as Spirits, or beings, physically considered. It is only a constitution of offices and officers among angels, by Christ the Head of all principalities and powers, giving them their grades, ranks and standing under him, which if they before sustained under the one God, was a new creation of God by him. And such as is often seen in human kingdoms, upon the alteration of the constitution, or the accession of a new Prince. When the first begotten was brought again at his resurrection, into the world, God said "Let all the angels of God worship him," and upon their compliance they were created by Christ their Lord, as thrones, &c. These things were created *by him* and *for him* for his use and service, as their proprietor and possessor. And to express his primacy and preeminence, it is said, "He is," not he was, *before all things*: that is all these things. *And by him all things consist.* As they are all given into his hands of the Father, he is the preserver and *upholder* Heb. i. 3. of them in their present state. "He was foreordained before the foundation of the world: the world and all things were created to bring that foreordination to pass: and when he was made Lord, and Christ, it might be truly said of him, He is before all things, in the order and succession of things." Since some with Dr. Whitby are fond of orthodox Fathers, the reader may see their thoughts upon this subject, not as authorities, for they are none, any more than the reputed heterodox. The following quotations will shew that these authors understood the christian theory, much better than modern scholastics and metaphysicians, spoilt by philosophy. Tertullian saith, "Touching the Messiah it is in the first place to be enquired whether we are not to expect the institutor of

a new law, and a new teſtament, of new ſacrifices, of new circumciſion, a new ſabbath (the Lord's day which he hath creatively made) one who abrogateth the old law, aboliſheth the old ceremonies, circumciſion, and Sabbath." Cyprian thus writes, "From the teſtimonies of ſcripture it appears, that by Chriſt we are to expect, new circumciſion, a new teſtament, new law, new yokes, new paſtors, new ſacrifices, a new prieſthood and people." Chryſoſtom ſaith, "In chriſtianity we have all things new, a new Jeruſalem, a new ſpiritual temple, a new houſe whoſe maker is God, a houſe not made with hands." Can all theſe things be effected without a new creation? Are not all theſe by Chriſt? Theſe things are viſible, and yet are not "metals, ſtones, vegetables, beaſts or trees," which cannot be chriſtianized.

God who ſpake in times paſt to the fathers by the prophets, made the *worlds* by that Son by whom he hath ſpoken to us in theſe laſt times. Heb. i. 1. This Son is deſcribed as being the *appointed Heir*, (Lord) of all things, as the brightneſs of his glory, and the expreſs image of his perſon, and as upholding all things by the word of his power, who when he had by himſelf purged our ſins, ſat down on the right hand of the majeſty on high.

Here is an implied negation of God's having ſpoken by his Son in times paſt, or until the laſt times of the Jewiſh ſtate. The *appointment* of his Son to be Heir or Lord of all things, ſhews it to be an official not an hereditary dignity, conſequential to his having purged our ſins. The creation of the worlds or ages, is by the ſame perſon and not any eternal Logos or Son. That the prime agent herein is God the majeſty on high. The worlds or ages is plural to include angels and men, or all economies which are completed in or by Chriſt. That the material ſyſtem is not included is evident from the whole context, and the manifeſt deſign of the Apoſtle, which is to

prove the Son's ſuperiority to angels, as the appointed Heir of all things, who was made better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels ſaid he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. This was at his reſurrection when all the angels of God are ordered to worſhip him, when God made the worlds by him, and not at the birth of Jeſus, for then he was only conſtituted the Son of God *by nature*, but not with *power*. There is not the leaſt intimation that the creation of theſe worlds was performed by any Son of God ſuppoſed to have exiſted prior to the birth of Jeſus, and who then condeſcended to be born and took Jeſus to himſelf, and therefore this prior act is predicated of the whole perſon as it now is, by a communion or communication of properties. Neither nature of Jeſus is any ſeparaate agent, and there could be no communion or communication of properties prior to the union of the natures to which theſe properties belong. And if this ſon had been the eternal creator of angels, they muſt have known it, and muſt always have worſhipped him for it, and needed no command for it now. Nor would there have been any need of labored proof of his ſuperiority to them. The Son no doubt is the maker of the things, and worlds of which he is the appointed Heir : and theſe are all included in the *world to come put in ſubjection to him*. As his kingdom, ſo his creation is not of this world : and for this creation only is he worſhipped. The 10, 11, 12, verſes of the firſt chapter of Hebrews have been applied to the Son, " And thou, Lord, in the beginning hath laid the foundation of the earth," &c. But the unprejudiced and attentive reader will ſee this to be a miſtake which great and good men have fallen into, if the following things are conſidered :—Firſt, the paſſage is quoted from Pſalms cii. 25, 26, 27, where the words evidently belong to God the Father, nor would any unbiaſſed reader of that Pſalm ever think to underſtand them

of any other but "the one God the Father, Almighty, maker, of heaven and earth." And the one God the Father, is not the holy child Jeſus, whom he hath anointed. Acts iv. 24, 27. Secondly, the making the worlds in the ſecond verſe is not the ſame with laying the foundation of the earth, &c. in the tenth verſe, nor performed alike. God *by the Son* made the worlds: but He layeth the foundations of the earth *alone*: ſo that the laying the foundation of the earth cannot be attributed to the Son, becauſe he is not the prime agent in any creation. Thirdly, it is plain that the "Thou art Lord," in verſe 10th, is the God who ſpake by the Son, who appointed him Heir of all things, who made the worlds by him, who ſaid to the only begotten thou art my Son, who brought him into the world again, and ſaid, let all the angels of God worſhip him, who ſaid unto the Son, thy throne O God is forever, the God that anointed him with the oil of gladneſs—Thou Lord who ſaid and did all theſe things hath laid the foundation of the earth; therefore the truth of the foregoing quotations from ſcripture may be relied upon: the change of the perſon from *He* to *Thou* is becauſe it ſtood ſo in the original text from whence it is taken. It may be added fourthly, that if the *Son* had laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens had been the work of his hands, the apoſtle took a deal of needleſs pains to prove his ſuperiority to angels. The worlds therefore had a new creator in Chriſt, and a new object of worſhip upon that account, and even the Father became a kind of new deity to angels and men, as revealing himſelf under a new character, and ſuſtaining new relations in and by Chriſt, unto us.

Another text aſcribes creation to Chriſt, "Write theſe things, ſaith He, who is the faithful and true witneſs, the *beginning* (arche) *of the creation of God*." The "*creation of God*," expreſſeth the ſpecific nature, kind, and quality of this creation, that it is ſpiritual, holy, and divine, and not the pro-

duction of what is terreſtrial and animal : as the phraſe, the kingdom of God, imports it to be a divine heavenly kingdom. And ſince the *faithful and true witneſs* is the *beginning, head, or author of it under God*, it muſt be new and mediatorial. Wherein it particularly conſiſts will be ſhewn hereafter, chap. xiii.

There are two reaſons in ſpecial which cauſed ſcholaſtics to be ſo zealous in their attempts to prove that the Son was the creator of the material ſyſtem : The one is that they ſuppoſe this creation to be the production of all things out of nothing : the other is, that they think his eſſential divinity cannot be ſupported without he was the creator of all material things. The firſt of theſe is a miſtake, and the latter will fall to the ground, when that is rectified. There is no word in any known language, which in its true notation, ſignifies the production of any thing out of nothing. The word for create in Hebrew, Greek, Latin and Engliſh, ſignifies no more than the change of the ſtate or nature of a thing or being, or both, as is done in material, or political building, either a houſe, temple, or city, or new creatures of ſuch as were old, or ſubjects of ſuch as were before aliens, ſtrangers, and foreigners.

That their fear, leſt the eſſential divinity of the Son, cannot be ſupported, unleſs he is held to be the creator of all material things, and of them out of nothing, is entirely groundleſs, the following things will ſhew.

1. *Firſt*, That creation in no ſenſe is evidential of mere divinity of nature. For nature is no agent of itſelf but the property of one. Angels and ſaints are made partakers of the divine nature, and yet ſuch participation gives them no *power* of creation. But if the power of creation was annexed to divinity of nature, all would be veſted with a creative power in proportion to the degrees and meaſures of their poſſeſſing divinity of nature. When men talk of the human, or divine natures doing this or that, they know not whereof they affirm.

2. *Secondly.* Every creator muſt be a perſonal Agent and in ſtate God. A property, accident, or denomination, cannot act ſeparate from its ſubject: and every creator muſt be in *ſtate* God. Even human politic creations are the products of thoſe who are *in ſtate*, gods. I. Pet. ii. 13, 14. To be a creator and a creature in the ſame reſpect is a contradiction. None but the one God hath the power of creation neceſſarily, originally, and underivedly, and if he communicate a creative power to any one, ſo far as that is imparted, he makes him in ſtate a god, and Son of the moſt High, conſidered as the Moſt High. Pſ. lxxxii. 6.

3. *Thirdly.* When a Being is in ſtate God, and veſted with the power of creation, and *the product* of that creative power is ſpiritual, holy and divine in its nature, that being muſt be divine by *nature* as well as ſtate. None by nature a creature, can create what is holy and divine. The production of material, terreſtrial, and animal things, only proves divinity of power. Theſe things iſſue from a parental providence, but not from paternal ſanctity. The chriſtian creation is ſpecifically divine, the creation of God, and therefore the prime efficient, and the mediate author, are both by nature God.

4. *Fourthly.* No being is worſhipped for mere *divinity of nature*, but for divinity of ſtate added thereunto. They who are gods only in ſtate as rulers, have only a right to civil worſhip. Angels and ſaints, though partakers of the divine nature, have no right to any worſhip at all, becauſe they are not divine by ſtate alſo. The Son of God, as Jeſus, claimed not direct worſhip, but when he became Chriſt, and eſpecially when he was exalted to his Father's throne, being God by nature and ſtate both, he hath an undoubted right to divine honor and worſhip. And ſince he is worſhipped as the enthroned lamb that was *ſlain* and becauſe he was ſlain; Rev. i. 5, 6. and v. 9. This proves his creation not to be old but *new* and complicated with redemption.

We as chriſtians or *men* creatures are by the one Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

That we are not by him as *men* is evident, becauſe what is natural and not ſpiritual is oppoſite to his character as ſpiritual, and a quickening ſpirit. I. Cor. xv. 45, 46. "The man is the head of the woman, but the head of every (chriſtian) man is Chriſt, and the head of Chriſt is God." "Ye are Chriſt's and Chriſt is God's." We are God's new creation kind of workmanſhip, created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works. The idea of the Son of God is now completed, excepting his mediatorſhip, the conſideration of which is left until we come to treat of the new teſtament or covenant of which he is mediator. Hence it appears that the ſcripture Son of God, Jeſus Chriſt, whom the only true God hath ſent, the ſecond perſon of the chriſtian Trinity, is totally different, from the ſcholaſtic Logos, or that eternal Son whom they have imagined to themſelves.

A ſyſtem of religion that neither teacheth the knowledge of the only true God, nor of Jeſus Chriſt, though it arrogate to itſelf the name of orthodoxy, demands no credit. And whether what hath been written above is of better character, is ſubmitted to the examination of all lovers of the truth; and direction and ſucceſs are wiſhed them in their impartial enquiries and conſequent judgment.

## CHAP. VIII.

### OF THE HOLY GHOST.

*Of the Holy Ghoſt: his perſonality, divinity, and office: a peculiar kind of perſon: the worſhip due to him according to his idea and work.*

THE term Spirit or Ghoſt is confeſſedly of various ſignification in ſcripture: yet there is an account of *one ſingular ſomewhat*, called the Holy Ghoſt or Spirit, very different from

any other being or thing called Spirit. Jews, Mahometans, and all denominations of chriſtians agree in this, how diverſified ſoever they may be in their apprehenſions concerning what is intended by the Spirit of God. That the holy ſpirit is ſometimes to be taken *impersonally* for the *virtue, influential power of God*, or fruits of that power, is readily granted: but that the Holy Ghoſt is not alſo ſometimes taken personally is denied.

1. That the Holy Ghoſt is a perſonal being or agent, there is ſufficient proof to ſatisfy the unprejudiced.

The very word Spirit denotes both his Perſon and Nature, the additions of holy, good, ſpirit of God, of Chriſt, of grace and truth, denote his properties, relations, operations and works. He is the Spirit of God from his *eternal relation to the Father*, and of Chriſt, as officially applying to his work of redemption, and of holineſs, as being vital ſanctity in himſelf and to us. A perſon is a diſtinct intellectualiſt, having the individual ſubſtance proper to ſuch an agent. Now the Holy Ghoſt hath perſonal properties, acts, attributes, and adjuncts aſcribed to him. This way we know the Father and the Son to be perſons, and for aught appears, their perſonality may be denied, as well as the perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt. If the Spirit was only a *virtue*, it muſt be *actuated*, and *not act*, and when not *actuated* would ceaſe to be; but the holy ſpirit always is. In the form of baptiſm he is joined with two perſons, as having a name, which is improper to a mere energy.

The ſpirit hath an underſtanding and will, ſearcheth even the deep things of God: I. Cor. ii. 10, 11. He only knoweth the things of God, as the ſpirit of a man which is in him, knoweth the things of a man. The ſpirit is ſaid to *come, depart, bear witneſs, make interceſſion*, &c. which are perſonal acts. Acts x. 19, and xiii. 2. Chriſt calls him *another comforter*, which with his appearances in a viſible form are incompatible to a virtue, and evidence him to be a perſonal agent.

2. He is an uncreated and divine perſon.

What hath an eſſential eternal relation to God, cannot be created, and we read of no manner of cauſation by which he is produced. If he was a creature, lying to, and blaſpheming of him would not be ſo heinous ſins, nor would his inhabitation make us the temple of God. Matt. xii. 3. I. Cor. vi. 19. His being called holy, the ſpirit of grace, and his works of inſpiration, and prophecy, argue his divinity. And theſe perſonal acts diſtinguiſh him from the Father, and the Son. What is related to another cannot be that other. He is expreſsly called the *eternal ſpirit*. Heb. ix. 14. By office He is the third perſon in the chriſtian trinity, which is the *triune* adminiſtration of the kingdom of God under its preſent conſtitution.

3. He is a perſon *ſui generis* of a *peculiar kind*.

The Father is imperial, ſtands in a politic relation to others, hath the titles of King, Lord and God, with the kingdom, power, glory, dominion, creation, preſervation, &c. aſcribed to him in ſcripture. He is repreſented as ſeated on a throne, in a reigning condition, as being a Lawgiver, and a Judge. And the ſame things are true of the Son in his exaltation ſtate to the glory of the Father. But the perſon of the Holy Ghoſt, though equally divine by nature, ſtands in no filial or fraternal relation to God, or Chriſt, or paternal to ſaints; though he is one with the Father and the Son in the divine ſovereignty, yet he ſuſtains no politic character, nor is the kingdom, power, and glory, ever aſcribed to him; chriſtians are not his creatures, children, ſubjects, people, conſidering of him perſonally. Prayers are not directed to him as our God, Creator, Redeemer or Savior. In no viſion do we find him on a throne, nor is he numbered with the politic perſons in the city of God. Heb. xii. 22, 23. All theſe things conſidered prove him to be a peculiar kind of perſon. Our definitive idea of him is that of an *eternal, undivided eſſentiality of the one God the Father, the fountain of divinity: and officially the inſpiration agent in the*

*kingdom of God, who animates all the ſubjects of it.* His manifold operations are repreſented by the ſeven ſpirits before the throne. If the ſcripture account of the Holy Ghoſt had been attended to, we ſhould have never heard, "That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, were one God, equal in power and glory." Or "That God was a moſt perfect eſſence conſiſting of three perſons." A ſameneſs of eſſence or ſubſtance conſtitutes no equality in power and glory, which belong not to the nature, but perſonal ſtate of God as reigning. Many of Dr. Watts's doxologies taken from the Popiſh liturgy are very faulty: As "Glory to the great and ſacred three;" "to the three and one;" "Glory to God the Trinity," &c. Some church covenants run in this unſcriptural form, "We avouch the Lord Jehovah, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to be our God." Such ſtuff merits the utmoſt diſapprobation of all ſcripture unitarians and trinitarians. As mere divinity of nature is not the ground of divine worſhip, but divinity of ſtate added thereto: and as divine worſhip is terminated on a perſonal object; ſo each divine perſon muſt be worſhipped according to his ſtate, work, and our relation to him.

4. Of the origination of the Holy Ghoſt, and of the manner of his deriving his being, the ſcriptures ſay nothing, though ſcholaſtics ſay much.

Reputed orthodox traditioniſts tell of an eternal productive proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father, and call the Father's act therein *ſpiration*, to diſtinguiſh it from, and match with their eternal generation of the Son. They can deſcribe neither of theſe emanations, nor tell how they differ, only in name. The only or chief text on which they ground the Spirit's proceſſion, relates to his proceeding from God in his miſſion to apply himſelf to his work. John xv. 26. And the ſame is ſpoken of the Son in his temporary miſſion, John viii. 42. "I proceeded forth and came from God, neither came

I of myſelf, but he ſent me." The word ſpiration they get from Chriſt's *breathing* on the apoſtles, ſaying, "receive the Holy Ghoſt," and apply it to his eternal proceſſion from the Father's breath. But this is to darken, and not illuminate the ſubject, by words without knowledge. The ſcriptures ſpeak of the Spirit as an agent in the Moſaic creation, and he was no doubt the author of the original ſanctity of all rationals. It was through this *eternal Spirit*, and not through his own eternal Godhead, that Chriſt offered up himſelf, and not one part of himſelf, through the other, as ſome have ſuppoſed. He is therefore *an eternal undivided eſſentiality*, of the one God the Father the fountain of divinity, and is divine by his neceſſary relation to Him who is neceſſarily exiſtent and divine.

But in his temporary miſſion he *proceeded* from the Father as ſent by him, and by juſt implication from the Son alſo, becauſe ſent by him. Indeed he is not ſaid to proceed from the Son, yet He is called the Spirit of God and of Chriſt, as officially acting for both. The long ſchiſm between the eaſtern and weſtern churches, becauſe the latter by *pious* fraud added *filioque* to the creed, expreſſing his proceſſion from the Son, as well as the Father, in his being, ſtands on the page of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, as a monument of the ignorance, ſuperſtition, bigotry and fraud, of ſome of thoſe from whom many are fond of taking their creed. It is becauſe the holy ſpirit is ſuch a peculiar kind of perſon, who ſtands in no politic relation to God, Chriſt or Saints, that the contemplation of him is ſo difficult. We have little or no help from analogy to aſſiſt our conceptions of him. But if we take him to be a divine perſon, an eternal undivided, and underived eſſentiality of the Father, who in his office and work, is not the Creator, the King, Lawgiver, Savior, Redeemer or Judge, but the *inſpiration agent* in the kingdom of God, the Renewer, Sanctifier, comforter, and applier of Chriſt's redemption, we ſhall not conceive much amiſs of him.

5. The Holy Ghoſt is now the third perſon in the chriſtian Trinity, but his work muſt be conſidered under ſeveral notions of him.

As an eternal eſſentiality of the one God, to him are to be attributed, the *garniſhing* and *completing* all the original works of God, and adding ſanctity to ſuch parts as were capable of it. No creature is holy without his operation. The heaven of happineſs, and all ſpirits, were originally made holy by him: *Holineſs* is his *kind of thing*. In the Moſaic creation He, moving on the waters, gave life and motion to all vitaliſts. And in the economy of grace the product of his operation is vital ſanctity. He acted as the prophetic ſpirit of Chriſt to come. I. Pet. i. 11. Through Him the will of God hath been revealed unto men in all ages of the world. II. Pet. i. 22. All gifts and graces are aſcribed to his agency. I. Cor. xii. 4. In the old teſtament times his operations were ſuited to that diſpenſation, *civil, moral,* and *typically ſpiritual*. Num. vi. 11, 16. I. Sam. x. 9. Jeſus was born of the Spirit, anointed with the Holy Ghoſt, acted in his miniſtry as not having the ſpirit by meaſure. Miracles, ſigns and wonders, were wrought through him, &c. The order in which the three divine perſons ſubſiſt in the Trinity, ſhews the order of their operation. The divine eſſence or nature, is one and indiviſible, *originally and primitively* the Father's as the fountain, *derivatively* the Son's as the ſtream, *communicatively* the Holy Ghoſt's as the vital ſanctity thereof, diſtinguiſhed perſonally by their intellects, from whence ariſeth a clear difference, and yet an union. The Father's *retained* eſſence or life, is not the Son's *derived* eſſence or life, and neither are the divine eſſence or life, the *communicative*, which is the Holy Ghoſt's. The acts of one perſon are not the acts of the whole. The Father is the ſender, the other two are ſent; but the Holy Ghoſt is not ſent as the Redeemer, but as the Renewer, Sanctifier and Comforter. There is a diſtinct

impreſſion of each on their works. The Holy Ghoſt is not the anima mundi of Platonics, but the author of divine animation to the kingdom of God, who actuates all the ſubjects of it. The divine ſovereignty of the Trinity is not of nature and providence, but of grace and ſanctity; all holineſs in creatures is derived from the Holy *One*, through the Spirit. The agency of the Spirit under the new teſtament, may be conſidered in relation to the *Head* of the Church, *the Church itſelf*, or to *particular members*. Thus we may conceive of the Holy Ghoſt, as a divine perſon, an eternal undivided eſſentiality of the Father. Officially the inſpiration agent in God's kingdom.

The worſhip due to him is correſpondent to his idea. We are to believe in him. Be baptized into his name. In the benediction the communion or communication of the Holy Ghoſt is prayed for. Our regeneration, renovation, and divine animation is by him: he is appealed to as a witneſs. We are dehorted from quenching, grieving, reſiſting, lying to, or blaſpheming him: and exhorted to be filled with, led by, walk in, and after the ſpirit. To worſhip, pray, and do all in the ſpirit, and bring forth his fruits. In our doxologies ſcripture forms ſhould be kept to: or ſuch as are agreeable to ſcripture ought only to be uſed. The moſt in common uſe are from the Roman ritual, and betray a ſhameful ignorance of the ſcripture doctrine of the Trinity. Polycarps the diſciple of St. John is evangelical. "I praiſe thee, I bleſs thee, O God, by the everlaſting high Prieſt, Jeſus Chriſt, thy beloved Son, by whom glory be to thee, together with him, through the holy ſpirit now and forever." Always keep in mind that the one God the Father is the ſupreme object of worſhip, and that we have acceſs to him, by the Son, through the ſame ſpirit.

## CHAP. IX.

### OF THE TRINITY.

*Of the Trinity: the Father the firſt perſon: the Son the ſecond perſon: the Holy Ghoſt the third perſon: how they are three, and yet one in eſſence or nature, and in the ſovereignty of God's kingdom.*

THE doctrine of the chriſtian Trinity is a peculiarity of the goſpel, and fundamental to the religion of Chriſt. It is not taught by the light of nature, nor by the old teſtament revelation. The Jews did not believe in it; nor could they know or embrace it until the goſpel revealed it, and it could not be revealed until Jeſus Chriſt was riſen from the dead, nor made a practical uſe of until he was exalted to the kingdom. Jeſus Chriſt, and no eternal Logos, is that Son who is the ſecond perſon in the Trinity, as the Father of him is the firſt, and the Holy Spirit of both, the third. An eternal Trinity, a parte ante, hath no foundation in ſcripture. Jeſus Chriſt, the ſame yeſterday, to-day and forever; but yeſterday no more ſignifies eternity paſt, than to-morrow doth eternity in future. The dreadful ſtuff contained in the Athanaſian creed, made by a Monk in France, ſome hundreds of years after his death, whoſe name is impoſed upon it by pious fraud, to give it credit, merits the abhorrence of all who make the holy ſcriptures their only rule of faith.

The Trinity are the three divine perſons mentioned in the form of baptiſm; Matt. xxviii. 19. and in the apoſtolic benediction: II. Cor. xiii. 14. and the three that bear record in heaven. I. John v. 7. They are the perſonal ſovereignty in the kingdom of God and of Chriſt. They are the Father;

the Son our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, or the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt, three diſtinct perſonal beings, and yet in ſome intelligible ſenſe, *one*, but not one God, Being, or compound intelligent agent.

*The firſt in order, dignity and preeminence, is the Father, the one perſonal God, in the abſolutely ſupreme, and independent ſenſe, who is of none, and beſides whom there is no other perſonal God in the ſame ſenſe.*

To maintain and ſupport the ſcripture doctrine of the Trinity, the monotheiſm of the Father muſt be eſtabliſhed, as neceſſarily exiſtent, uncauſed, unoriginate, and independent, poſſeſſed of all divine, vital, perſonal, and imperial perfections in a degree manner and tranſcendent to all creatures. He is but one Being, that is one intelligent Agent, or Perſon, according to the common notion of a perſon, even a diſtinct individual intellectualiſt, with one underſtanding, mind, and will; and a Being, or God, can have no more, without deſtroying its individuality. The exiſtence of this one perſonal God, is in the order of nature, prior to the being of the chriſtian Trinity. The orthodox Triunity, as it ought to be called, is no Trinity, any more than a three unit is a Trinity in Arithmetic.

An *individual three being, perſon or agent* or a *compounded one being, perſon, or agent*, are full as intelligible, and as agreeable to reaſon, ſcripture, and the analogy of things. The one God hath life in himſelf, of himſelf; He is autotheos, God of himſelf by neceſſity of nature. and the *fountain* of divinity of *nature* and *ſtate* to all poſſeſſed of either, or of both. The ſcriptures know of no Trinity but what is conſiſtent with, and derived from the monotheiſm of the Father, the only true God, who only hath immortality, who only is wiſe, holy, and good in the abſolutely ſupreme and underived ſenſe. All of being and divinity which the Son and Holy Ghoſt have, is from the Father, or becauſe of their relation to him: but he derives no

eſſentiality from them, having the reaſon of his exiſtence, divinity, perfections, and government in himſelf. He is the God, as much as the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in his whole perſon, and higheſt capacity. No title that will not bear the addition of Son belongs to the ſecond perſon in the chriſtian Trinity. If he is Jehovah, it is as a Son. If he is the everlaſting Father, it is as a Son of the abſolutely eternal God. If he is God over all, the Father is excepted. If he is the true God, it is as the Son of the only true God in the ſupreme ſenſe. David was the only true king of Iſrael in the ſupreme ſenſe, even after Solomon was crowned at Gihon: for He did not make him king of himſelf. The Son calls the firſt perſon his God, as well as Father: and even where the Son himſelf is termed God, he is ſaid to have a God. Heb. i. 8, 9. The Father is the *only* God. John v. 44. The only Lord God. Jud. 4. The Father is greater than the Son, not as to one nature, but as to his whole perſon. John xiv. 28. The Father is greater in the throne than the Son. *Him that ſitteth* on the throne, is a periphraſis of the Father. A preeminence to the receiver, belongs to the giver; The genitor is prior to the generated, and the ſender to the ſent. To underſtand all this of a mere nature, makes no ſenſe at all, for neither nature nor both natures in the Son, is a perſonal agent, without that intellect which exiſts in theſe natures. This preeminence and monotheiſm of the Father ought to be maintained as the foundation of all natural and revealed religion. It by no means derogates from the real and true divinity of the Son and Holy Ghoſt. But never in ſcripture are they conjunctly with the Father, repreſented as the one God: nor yet are either of them or both of them, another God, or other Gods beſides him, becauſe they are the Father's own divine Son, and Spirit, but not ſupreme or independent. They exiſt within the boundaries of the one undivided eſſence, and ſovereignty, and are

as far from being creatures, or of the creature ſubject party in God's kingdom, as the Father himſelf is. The Son of God, and the Spirit of God, cannot be of a different ſpecies from God, though they muſt have ſome kind of dependent relation to him: whereas to ſuppoſe any ſuch thing of the Father would be a derogation.

It is on this primacy, and preeminence of the Father, that the miſſion of the Son and Holy Ghoſt is grounded. For the Father to ſend his Son and Spirit, involves no incongruity, becauſe he is the *owner* of them: but for them to ſend *Him*, would be a great impropriety: and yet if there was that full equality ſome contend for, each might ſend the other, or rather neither could ſend nor be ſent, as there muſt be a preeminence in the ſender to the ſent. And as to the Supreme God's under a firſt denomination, ſending the Supreme God under a ſecond, or third denomination, it is a mere abſurdity. A denomination cannot be a miſſionary, nor can any compounded being or perſon ſend a part of himſelf. The priority of the Father to the Son, is not of another, but of the ſame ſpecies of being, whereby as a Father, he is the origin, fountain, root, cauſe and head of another like himſelf, his *engraved image*. Never doth the terms God, Father, Being, ſignify more than one intelligent agent. And a perſon cannot be leſs than one intelligent agent. If a God, a Father, or Being, is more than one intelligent perſonal agent, it deſtroys his individuality, and makes three perſonal Fathers, Gods and Beings. The aſſertion of Dr. Edwards in his Theol. Reformata is big with abſurdity, and flatly repugnant to reaſon, ſcripture, common ſenſe, and the analogy of things. "We the orthodox aſſert that as there is but one true God, ſo in Him, there are a plurality of perſons, and theſe perſons, are three, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt." Again "To form a right notion of the true God, we muſt ſet him before us, as a moſt bleſſed eſſence conſiſting of three perſons." If

*ve orthodox*, had not been prefixed to this ſtrange aſſertion, it might have been called heterodoxy, and tranſlation, or nonſenſe to the underſtanding of mankind. All human beings are in the one God as a parental providence: Acts xvii. 28. all holy beings are in him as the fountain of Sanctity. John xvii. 21, Heb. ii. 11. But they do not conſtitute him the one God, He is the one God independent of them: ſo alſo is He independent of the Son and Holy Ghoſt. The ſameneſs of the divine nature or eſſence (both are the ſame) in all beings that partake of it, as all holy beings do in a meaſure, doth not conſtitute them in conjunction with the Father the one God. Living ſtreams iſſuing from a living fountain, do not conſtitute the fountain what it is; nor do rays of light, proceeding from the Sun as their ſource, form the Sun. An eſſence or nature is that in which an intellect exiſts, and where the intellect is but one, (and a compound intellect is nonſenſe) perſonality can be but one, however perfect or unbounded the eſſence or nature may be, or how many ſoever perſonal agents ſubſiſt in or partake of that eſſence. For it is the eſſence of one intelligent agent, which is the fountain to all the reſt, and in him it is neceſſary, unoriginate, underived, and He therefore is the one God in the abſolutely ſupreme ſenſe, beſides whom there is no other in the ſame ſenſe.

The ſecond Perſon in the chriſtian Trinity, is the only begotten Son of the One God the Father, even our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in his exalted ſtate, and not any eternal Son, or eternal *Logos*, or any divine nature, abſtracted from the whole perſon of the Son, conſiſting of two natures, in which his intellect ſubſiſts.

This illuſtrious perſonage, whoſe origination by his Bethlehemetical generation and nativity, hath been deſcribed, was conſtituted of the divine nature, a true body, and a reaſonable ſoul: he was not created but begotten: was not a creature,

not a divine Son of a divine Father. He was firſt a child born, which native beinſhip and dignity continued during the whole time of his progreſs towards perfection, his being with God, as God, and ſubſiſting in the form of God. Then he became a Son given in his public miniſtry: and afterwards in his exaltation ſtate the government came upon his ſhoulders: and He is in ſtate God over all, the Father alone excepted. In every ſtate his perſon is eſſentially the ſame divine and human by his natures. In his humiliation ſtate, he took part of fleſh and blood for a little while, and was in ſtate man and the ſon of man, but ſince his exaltation ſtate, He is in ſtate God: what he aſſumed in his incarnation he hath now laid aſide: and yet in all eſſential conſtitutives of his perſon, He is ever the ſame, yeſterday, today, and forever. Things predicable of him in one ſtate are not true of him in another, and He was in two ſtates at one and the ſame time: the appendages of one ſtate are laid aſide when he paſſes into another ſtate; as the form of God, for the form of a ſervant in the likeneſs of men: and as exalted he is neither in that form of God, he emptied himſelf of, nor yet in the likeneſs of men, though one like to the ſon of man. But when he ſhall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, it is likely he will then return to the form of God in which he ſubſiſted at the termination of his creative capacity, and will be God, with God.

The third Perſon in the chriſtian Trinity is the *Holy Ghoſt*.

He hath been proved to be a perſonal agent, and not a mere virtue or energy: divine and not a creature: an eternal undivided eſſentiality of the one God, and not cauſed by any productive proceſſion, or ſpiration. Officially the inſpiration agent in the kingdom of God, and a peculiar kind of perſon, not having no politic relation to God, Chriſt, Angels, the Church, or individual Saints. His divinity of *nature* appears from his ſanctity, for ſanctity is divinity: and his divinity of

*ſtate* is evident from his junction with the Father and the Son in the divine ſovereignty. The eſſence and power of the Holy Ghoſt, like that of the Son's, is not another divided from the Father's, but *his* communicated, manifeſted, and exerciſed in a certain way and manner peculiar to the Holy Spirit, to the Father's glory, the ſource and fountain of all divinity of ſtate, and nature. The honor therefore due to each, muſt be divine according to their perſonal characters, and works: and the reaſon of this worſhip cannot be the ſame in each perſon, but differs as "of whom are all things, by whom are all things, through whom are all things," differ. The intelligent worſhipper will not confound theſe diſtinctions, miſplace them, nor unite them as mere denominations in one Agent, Being, or God.

Theſe three, the Father, the Son or the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt, are therefore three divine perſons, and not three modalities or denominations of one common being: and yet in ſome real and important ſenſe *one* I. John v. 7. Whether this text is canonical, the reader is referred to Travis' Letters, and others who have written upon it. This theory depends not upon one particular text. That they are not three modalities, denominations or relations of one God, appears from their bearing *record*, for then the witneſs would be of one and not of three. A triune teſtimony was never heard of. They cannot be three in the ſame ſenſe or reſpect they are one; nor one in the ſame ſenſe they are three. The original for one is not εἷς which ſignifies a perſonal, but *en* which imports a compound unity, but not an union of ſeveral perſonalities or intelligences in one Being or God. It is the ſame word that is uſed for the oneneſs of Chriſt and believers. John xvii. 21. If it imports a perſonal or eſſential unity by the notation of the word, in one caſe, it doth in the other: which will prove too much for orthodox ſcholaſtics themſelves.

A perſon is a diſtinct individual intellectualiſt, exiſting in an individual ſubſtance, nature or eſſence: the ſubſtance, nature, or eſſence in which an intellect exiſts is not a perſon, but both conſtitute perſonality. The life, nature, eſſence, or vital ſubſtance of a being, is what denominates or diſtinguiſheth it, from others of another ſpecies or kind. A *ſpecific* ſameneſs of eſſence doth not conſtitute the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt one God, any more than a ſpecific ſameneſs of eſſence conſtitutes three men, *one man*. The term God never ſignifies more than one intelligent agent, any more than *man* doth more than one perſonal agent. It is impoſſible a perſon ſhould be leſs than one intelligent agent: and it is certain three intelligent agents, cannot be one intelligent agent, any more than one intelligent agent, can be three intelligent agents.

Even a numerical ſameneſs of eſſence doth not conſtitute a ſameneſs of perſonality: for this eſſence may be diſtinguiſhable by the ſeveral intellects which exiſt in it, and yet not be diviſible. And ſeveral natures or eſſences may belong to one perſon, and yet there not be ſeveral perſons in one God, or Being, for this would be the ſame as ſeveral perſons in one perſon, which is impoſſible.

The explaining how the three divine perſons may be in one *eſſence* and *ſovereignty*, and yet the Father alone be the one God, in the ſupreme abſolute ſenſe, ſhall be attempted, to render this doctrine of baptiſm intelligible.

1. By eſſence, nature, or life, for they are the ſame, is not to be underſtood a being or perſonal agent, but a certain ſpecific conſtitutive of a being or perſonal agent, which diſtinguiſheth him from all others of another kind, and determines and denominates him to whom it belongs, to be what he is. One perſon may have more natures than one, yet theſe ſeveral natures have no diſtinct ſeparate exiſtence, from the perſon, or diſtinct power of agency or capacity of ſuffering, ſo that it can be ſaid that either nature acts or ſuffers ſeparate from the perſon whoſe nature it is

A nature or eſſence being the vital ſubſtance of an individual intellectual diſt, is the comprehenſion of certain innate properties, and qualities, in which there are ſympathies and antipathies, which prevent reaſon, deliberation, and choice, and may be conſidered as an inſtinct or conſtitution. There is ſuch a nature in all vital beings according to their kind, the wolf is ſavage, the lamb meek, the ſerpent ſubtle, and the dove harmleſs, by nature. Now the divine nature is the vital conſtitutive ſubſtance of the infinite intellect of God: and is ſuperhuman, ſupra-angelical, and creature-tranſcendent. There is but one *kind of divine* nature, as there is ſpecifically but one human nature, how many ſoever partake of either. And by the divine nature is not meant the metaphyſical eſſence of God as the firſt being, for religion hath no manner of concern with the ſcience of analogy. All ſpirits iſſuing from the Father of ſpirits may partake of the phyſical eſſence of the Deity, but this puts no difference between them only in degree. In phyſical entity, immateriality, intellectuality, inviſibility, immortality, &c. there may be only a *gradual* difference between good and evil beings, but the evil partake not of the divine nature or image in the ſcripture ſenſe. By the divine nature is intended that which is the life, vital ſubſtance, and conſtitution of God, as God. This is vital ſanctity in infinite fulneſs. It belongs to no creatures as creatures, and all who partake of it in any degree, do ſo by derivation, and communication from God as the fountain: in ſcripture language they are partakers of his holineſs which is the divine nature. He alone is neceſſarily, originally and infinitely holy. Sanctity is both the *immaculate purity*, and *unrivalled dignity of God*. His *diſtinguishing*, and *creature-tranſcendency*, whereby he is God by nature and ſtate. The quantity of his phyſical entity, "the degrees of his exiſtence," the infinity of his underſtanding, &c. abſtracted from the vital ſanctity of his nature, do not therefore conſtitute him God.

2. Vital fanctity, being the divine nature, this is the one unoriginate effence of the one God, the Father alone, the fountain of divinity. It is in him an infinite ocean, and inexhauftible fource, of light, love, and eternal holy vitality. This in its unbounded fulnefs is all the Father's, and is the fountain of divinity to all who partake of it. In him it is underived, uncaufed, from everlafting to everlafting. In there was any divine effence, not the effence of the Father as the *fountain* of divinity, there would be more divine effences than one, and the one undivided effence of the one God would be wanting, and alfo the Father could not be what his name and relations to the Son and the Holy Ghoft import him to be, a fountain unto them. If the divine effence was *fterile* and had no power of *fecundity*, none could partake of it but the one God. But he hath a power of deriving it to others. From this divine effence in its unbounded fulnefs the Son's *conftitutive diftinct perfonal effence is derived.* "As the Father hath life in himfelf, fo hath he *given* to the Son to have life in himfelf." John v. 26. The Father's life is uncaufed, and of himfelf, but the Son's life is the Father's gift, life of his life, divine and eternal. Hence the Son's effence the derivative, is the Father's effence *comprehenfively*, and yet the Son's effence conftitutively as the diftinct vital fubftance of his perfonal intellect. This explains how he is in the Father, and the Father in him, and they are one.

In a reftrained fenfe, the divine effence, is the perfonal effence of the Father, *the life retained in himfelf*, after he gave to the Son to have life in himfelf. This is conftituitive of no other perfon, for if the Son's given life, was not diftinct from the Father's retained life, the Father would fuffer, which doctrine of the patripapians is to be rejected. The great Jehovah cannot die. The Son, as God manifeft in flefh, purchafed the church with his own perfonal blood, and gave his life for us.

3. The divine nature is vital, ſpirit, and life: "God is pure ſpirit," or ſpirituality, if the word may be uſed. Therefore the Son's generated life muſt be *life* of life, and *ſpirit* born of ſpirit, light of light, love of love, eternal life of eternal life, which was with the Father. This vital ſanctity, which is the ſpecific nature of the Father, ſo as to be an exiſtent individual ſubſtance, is communicated in a *degree* to all ſaints, and they are one with God and Chriſt, as the Father and Son are one: John xvii. 22. but it is not conſtitutive of their perſons: the union is not in the ſame *degree*, for in the Son *dwells all the fulneſs of the godhead bodily*, ſo as to be the conſtitutive ſubſtance of his intellect, and in conjunction with the human nature, forms his diſtinct perſonality as the only begotten of the Father, and gives this firſt born a preeminence above his many brethren, who are creatures, and the children of God alſo. And as the Father was *imperial* or the *higheſt* in begetting his only Son, that Son muſt be imperial alſo, the King the Son, and ſubject-tranſcendent; as well as creature-tranſcendent.

4. In the Son's generation, the Father's eſſence was ſo *imparted* as not to be *divided* from his own, as is the caſe in human generations. The Son's communicated life was like a living ſtream iſſuing from a living fountain, ſo that the ſtream itſelf is a ſource of vitality to others, as the fountain is to *that*. "It pleaſed the Father that in him all fulneſs ſhould dwell, and of his fulneſs we receive grace for grace." Grace in man is nature in God. There is a mutual indwelling between the fountain and the ſtream, they live in each other, are *diſtinct*, and yet *one*, and the ſmaller rivulets are in them, and one with them in a lower degree. "He that ſanctifieth and they who are ſanctified are all of one." Heb. ii. 11. As the Son's life is not divided from the Father's, the Father's life being eternal, the Son's muſt be eternal alſo, and in infinite fulneſs. "All things that the Father hath are mine." The Son exiſting with-

in the boundaries of the godhead as a perſon of it, is not of the ſubject creature party, and yet is ſubject to his God and Father, as a dutiful Son ought to be. Jeſus is the divine King, the Son, of the divine King the Father.

5. The Son muſt be a derivative and not ſelf-originate, or eternal a parte ante.

Theſe are as peculiar to the Son, as ſelf exiſtence is to the Father. Two uncauſed perſonal eſſences in the godhead, would neceſſarily make a plurality of Gods. An eternal neceſſary generation is impoſſible. God is not *always Father* as *he is always God*. The Father muſt be a free agent, elſe Jeſus would not be the Son of his love.

Dr. Edwards in Theol. Reformata, Vol I. p. 289 after acknowledging the Son's eſſence to be *derived*, adds, "This doth not hinder or deſtroy the ſelf-origination of it." And this ſtrange aſſertion is thus ſupported. "The eſſence of the Father being ſelf exiſtent, that of the Son muſt be ſo too, ſeeing the eſſence of the Father and of the Son is the ſame." And therefore with Athanaſius, Calvin Beza, &c. he ſaith the Son is *autotheos God, of himſelf*. This, ſaith he, ought not to ſeem ſtrange to them who are acquainted with our Savior's words. "As the Father hath life in himſelf, ſo hath he given to the Son to have life in himſelf." The Son's life is *given*, then he hath it in *himſelf*, and ſo have all the regenerate in a degree. But can given life be neceſſary, or unoriginate? The Rev. John Barnard, in a ſermon delivered at a Boſton lecture, 1761, from I. John v. 20, publiſhed at the deſire of the hearers, ſaith, page 14, "I cannot but think Jeſus Chriſt is as truly and properly the Son of God, as Iſaac was the ſon of Abraham, whom Abraham is ſaid to beget." And in page 23, he affirms the Son to be *ſelf-exiſtent*, and independent, "becauſe there can be no being prior to him, from which he ſhould derive, and on which he can be dependent." Thus he forgets the Father of

puts the Son in his place. Here Trinitarians and Antitrinitarians divide, and the former are charged with Tritheism by the latter. It may be neceſſary to ſee if they can clear themſelves from this high charge. Since the Father *gave* the Son his life, it could not be *ſelf-originated*, and its being; *in himſelf* after ſuch gift, is as true of others, as of *him*, who are made partakers of divine life. And although the Father's and the Son's life are in ſome ſenſe the ſame: yet the Father's *retained* life, is not the Son's *given* life. But ſaith Dr. Edwards, "The whole divine eſſence is wholly in each perſon, and was ever ſo from all eternity." But this wants proof. The ſuppoſition of an eternal Son, by an eternal generation, hath neither reaſon, ſcripture, nor common ſenſe to ſupport it, and entirely deſtroys the being of the only begotten Son, according to the ſcripture account of his only generation and nativity at Bethlehem. His way of arguing in creation will apply here, and in the productive proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, by ſpiration. "The cauſe muſt precede the effect, and an eternal cauſe of an eternal effect, it is abſurd to ſuppoſe, becauſe it is impoſſible, what had its being from another ſhould be co-exiſtent with it." He ſaith we ſhall be called Tritheiſts: and what then? Some of the ancient fathers were ſo called. Rather than not be orthodox, he would run the venture of this charge. But this is a miſerable conſolation. To be erroneous in ſo important a point, becauſe ſome called orthodox by themſelves and party, were really erroneous according to ſcripture, is certainly not commendable. If the Father is Autotheos, God of himſelf, and the Son is Autotheos, and the Holy Ghoſt is Autotheos, three Autotheoi cannot be one Autotheos: as well may three units, be one unit. If the three perſons have one common eſſence, yet each hath its own diſtinct intellect, and a diſtinct perſonal eſſence in which it exiſts, without any ſeparation or diviſion of the one eſſence. The perſonal eſſence of the Father can no more

be the perſonal eſſence of the Son, than the Father himſelf can be the Son himſelf. The Father's *underived life retained in himſelf*, is not the Son's derived given life. The living fountain is not the living ſtream iſſuing from it, nor is the ſtream the fountain. They are as diſtinct as the exemplar and expreſs image. No ſameneſs of eſſence will make the ſtream or the image ſelf exiſtent, though the ſtream is in the fountain as its ſource: nor can the fountain be the ſtream and derived, though it dwells in the ſtream and is a living fountain to it. The divine eſſence of itſelf doth not conſtitute perſonality, but is the vital ſubſtance of the three perſons, with ſuch diſtinctneſs, that each intellect hath its own perſonal eſſence. The communication of that eſſence in an *equal degree* to the three perſons, will not render them in *all reſpects equal*, becauſe the Father is the fountain of divinity to the other two perſons, and therefore *He alone*, and not the three, is the one God in the ſupreme ſenſe, as he alone is of none, and beſides or without him, there is no other in the ſame ſenſe, or in any other real ſenſe. But to ſuppoſe three perſons of the ſame eſſence, each a fountain to himſelf, equal in power and glory, is Tritheiſm, let the charge fall where it will, and no unity of conſent frees from it. Since mere nature doth not conſtitute perſonality, and divinity of nature is no perſonal object of worſhip, the worſhip of three equal perſons, each divine, muſt be the worſhip of three Gods, notwithſtanding their unity of eſſence and conſent. And if the eſſence of the Son is derived as hath been confeſſed, its ſelf exiſtence is a contradiction, and is the ſame as for a thing to be and not to be. No company of all the orthodox fathers in the world is ſufficient to excuſe any in their adherence to ſuch erroneous opinions. It is theſe Tritheiſtic and contradictory tenets, pertinaciouſly adhered to, for the ſake of their Diana, *orthodoxy, and good company*, that gives ſuch juſt cauſe of offence to Jews, and others as good

men, if not better than they : makes Deists, and keeps multitudes back from professing Christianity. This stumbling block, Athanasians, and orthodox Trinitarians, and Triunitarians, ought to remove out of the way, as it is of their own laying.

The divine essence is distinguishable into what it is *primitively*, and what it is *derivatively*, the former is the Father's retained life, the latter is the Son's given personal life. It became of this twofold consideration upon the Son's generation, when it was imparted, but not divided, and so the same essence of the one God originally and comprehensively, became the essence of two divine persons, the Father's primitively, and the Son's derivatively, without any division. The derivative essence, in the large comprehension, is the Father's, and as imparted, but not parted with, it may be called the *undivided derivative*. And an individual intellect with an individual substance being a person, if the individual substance is wanting, there can be no individual person : therefore the Father generated no Son, if no distinct individual substance was derived. One intellect can constitute only one person, and to each intellect there must be a distinct vital substance, otherwise it will be no person, but a mere modality. Such a Trinity some hold to, making the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, only relative properties or denominations, which they say are incommunicable, and constitute three persons, when in fact they are but three modes of the being of the one God in one essence. Thus the schoolmen, Drs. Wallis, and South, &c. Sabellianize, as the others Tritheize. Good Dr. Watts adopts this *indwelling* scheme, of one infinite spirit under three relations. But a relation is only a denomination, neither *ousia essence*, nor *hypostasis substance*, are a person. Some erroneously suppose substantiality constitutes personality, but this is a mistake, there must be intellectuality also, and there may be several distinct substances in one person, as in Christ, divine, human, and animal

in the days of his flesh, and yet he never had more than one intellect. If God is but one infinite Spirit, under three relations or denominations, he is but one personal object of worship, and Dr. Watts' doxologies are absurd.

Each person must be a distinct intelligent agent to be an object of worship. There is no specific difference in spirits, as spirits: The difference between holy angels and devils lies not in their intellects, but in the natures wherein they exist or of which they consist, the one is vitally holy, the other is vitally wicked. Though an individual substance must concur to constitute personality, yet the addition of one or more substances doth not double the personality as we see in man's partaking of the divine nature, he was a person before, and is but one person afterwards. But the addition of one intellect to another will make two persons if they have a nature to exist in. And if two or three intellects by having a common essence are one God, they by having each its essence are equally three Gods, as hath been proved against the Athanasians. On the other hand if there is but one infinite spirit, no multiplicity of natures, relations, or denominations, will constitute him more than one personal agent: to ascribe distinct worship to these natures, relations, or denominations, is improper and absurd. Our idea of the Trinity is equally clear from Tritheism, and Sabellianism, which makes it to consist only in three modalities, relations, or denominations, without intellectuality, to found personality upon.

6. Besides the divine essence the primitive, and the derivative without any division: there is the divine essence the communicative: and this vitality, the communicative, is the essence of the Holy Spirit, an *undivided* essentiality of the one God who is the Father.

The imperial Father is the head of a vital empire, and must possess that life which is *constituitive* of his person, and that life

which is *communicative*, which is the eſſence of the Holy Spirit, who was the Father's agent in creation, and in the Son's generation, and in the communication of vital ſanctity to the whole empire. And the imperial Son is mediate Head of a vital empire: and there is in his eſſence the vitality which is *conſtituitive* of his perſon, and the vitality which is *communicative*. Therefore the one divine eſſence muſt be conſidered as it is the *conſtituitive perſonal eſſence of the Father as the primitive*, and the *conſtituitive perſonal eſſence of the Son, as the derivative, confronted to the divine eſſence the communicative, which is the conſtituitive eſſence of the Holy Ghoſt*. That vitality which the Father's eſſence is, as the primitive, muſt be confronted to the Son's as the derivative, and as it is the *conſtituitive*, it is confronted to the *communicative*, which is the Holy Ghoſt's. And in like manner the vitality of the Son as the *derivative*, muſt be confronted to the vitality the primitive; and as it is merely the *conſtituitive* of his perſon, it muſt be confronted to the *communicative*.

Moreover as the Son is, conjunctly and yet ſubordinately, with the Father, the head of a vital empire, the third perſon, who is *vital ſanctity the communicative*, muſt be derived from the firſt to the ſecond perſon, and in his *miſſion* proceed from both. Now as *vital ſanctity* is not an accident, or modality, but a ſubſtance, and the Son and Holy Ghoſt both partake of it *in a divine degree*, they can be no creatures by nature. And ſince the divine eſſence is *numerically* one in the Father as the fountain, and *ſpecifically* one in each perſon: the Father muſt be the one God and the centre of unity to the Son and Holy Ghoſt. Thus an unity of the divine eſſence is preſerved in the Father: and ſubordinate to his monotheiſm we have a Trinity of divine perſons in the undivided eſſence of the one God, and a diſtinctneſs of eſſence in the other two perſons by their intellects. The Father's is the living fountain, the Son's conſtituitive

eſſence is the living ſtream, and the Holy Ghoſt's is the vitality, the communicative from both.

Theſe three divine perſons are alſo of one undivided ſovereignty in the kingdom of God.

This is an imperial political unity, and belongs to their ſtate, as the other did to their nature. The authority is *original* in the Father, *derived* to the Son, and adminiſtered by him through the inſpiration agency of the Holy Ghoſt, to the glory of the Father the fountain of power. It is a triune government, if any like the word, *one* in the Father its fountain, and twofold beſide, in the exerciſe of it. Each divine perſon acts according to their reſpective ideas, and the perſonal order of their ſubſiſtence. This doctrine of baptiſm, called a myſtery by ſcholaſtics, but not by ſcripture, into which babes in Chriſt are baptized, may be ſummed up in few words. "It is the ſubſiſtence of three divine perſons in one undivided eſſence or nature, each in their order, and their threefold adminiſtration in the kingdom of God, as conſtituted at the reſurrection and conſequent exaltation of Chriſt, by an undivided ſovereignty." The Father, as ſupreme, is the one God, "of whom are all things:" the Son, as divine in nature and ſtate, "by whom are all things:" the Holy Ghoſt, a divine perſonal agent, "through whom are all things." And the worſhip due to each, is in the ſame order, "by the Son, through the ſame ſpirit we have acceſs to the Father."

All holy perſons and ſerious enquirers after truth, are left to judge of themſelves what is right, concerning the preceding explanation of the ſcripture doctrine of the Chriſtian Trinity. It is hoped orthodox Trinitarians, ſo called, and Unitarians or Antitrinitarians ſo reputed, will reconſider their ſentiments upon this doctrine, for it is important, and not a mere ſpeculation, and all their principles of divinity in general, will take their *tincture* from their apprehenſions of it: and the

underſtanding and believing it aright, will have a ſalutary influence upon their lives and practice. The conceiving of it as a myſtery, and underſtanding a myſtery to be ſomething inexplicable and incomprehenſible, have contributed much, through want of a habit of thinking, and a ſpirit of free inquiry, to that profound ignorance, many, and even divines are chargeable with, of this doctrine.

It is very ſeldom treated of, and when it is, it is in a way that either ſhews they do not underſtand it, or are enchained by creeds and catechiſms, which in terminis contradict ſcripture, and are evidently repugnant to reaſon, common ſenſe, and the analogy of things. It is too true, how much ſoever it is to be lamented, that if any try to break their fetters and think for themſelves, and eſpecially if they make known the reſult of their enquiries upon this ſubject, the no-thinking traditioniſts are too apt to ſtigmatize them as heretical, even when they propagate only the unadulterated truths of ſcripture, if they happen not to coincide with commonly received opinions. It is hoped the reader of this will preſerve a mind of his own to be perſuaded in, free and independent of all *pretended* human authority, but *real* tyranny and uſurped lordſhip over the faith and conſciences of men.

## CHAP. X.

### OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

*The Kingdom of God of which the Chriſtian Trinity are the Perſonal Sovereignty, defined and deſcribed.*

AS God is definitively the Divine Majeſty, he muſt have a kingdom appropriately *his own*. His dominion in nature and providence is as extenſive as creation, and ſtrictly univerſal.

But this is not the imperial eſtate, or the imperſonal ſovereignty of the chriſtian Trinity. The doctrine of a trinity belongs not to nature, but to grace, not to Judaiſm, but to Chriſtianity as eſtabliſhed ſince the reſurrection of the ſecond perſon in it, from the dead, and exaltation to the throne of God. The kingdom of God, of Chriſt, and of heaven, are the ſame, it is not once named in the Jewiſh law, for it had not come, was not created, or erected, in old teſtament times. And although the name is found in Jewiſh writers, they meant not the ſame thing the goſpel intends by it. It had not come, but was *at hand*, when Chriſt began to preach, and Chriſt directs his diſciples to pray for its coming, and it did come at his reſurrection, when he was advanced to the throne of it, as the mediatorial creator of all things new. As it is peculiar to the goſpel, its ſeveral ſignifications muſt be deduced from the new teſtament revelation. Theſe are *three*, to which all others are reducible, agreeably to the common uſe of the word kingdom.

The region or territory. The reigning eſtate, or perſonal ſovereignty. The Polity, including the goods of it, ſanctity and glory.

1. The Kingdom of God ſignifies the *region* or *territory*, *even heaven*, *locally underſtood*.

This is the celeſtial paradiſe, the ſupernal city, the region of immortality and beatitude, where is the court, throne and reſidence of the great King. Matt. v. 10. and ix. 47. We read of heavenly places, manſions, and a third heaven. This divine territory includes the whole circumference of the etherial regions, and fixed ſtars, where the vaſt univerſe of holy ſpirits, who have their exiſtence in the heavenly ſtate of life and bleſſedneſs, dwell. Properly all that is not this world, is heaven or a manſion of it, for in this world is hell, and heaven and hell divide the univerſe. Some no mean chriſtian Philoſophers have placed the throne of God and the Lamb right over

the *milky way*, which is the cauſe of its effulgence and brightneſs, notwithſtanding its vaſt diſtance from hence.

2. The kingdom ſignifies the *reigning eſtate* or *perſonal ſovereignty*. The kingdom of God, and of Chriſt, is their eſtate of reigning in the ſovereign adminiſtration of things. Matt. xvi. 28. The coming of Chriſt in his kingdom is to be underſtood of his reigning condition. Mark ix. 1. comp. Luke xxi. 31. So it is to be underſtood in the requeſt of the penitent thief. And when Chriſt ſaith "My kingdom is not of this world:" it means his eſtate of reigning.

3. It ſignifies that *polity* of which God and Chriſt are the perſonal ſovereignty, including the good of it, ſanctity and glory.

This is the kingdom of God and ſaints, of Chriſt and ſanctity, grace and glory. God the judge of all is the ſupreme Head, Chriſt the mediatorial ſovereign, the Holy Ghoſt the inſpiration agent, and animating ſpirit, angels and holy men the ſubjects, ſanctity and glory the goods of it. Heb. xii. 22, 23. It is a regular orderly polity, the parts of it are united together by an implicit or explicit confederacy, having a conſtitution and common law, and is held together by the bonds of rights and dues. It is the ſame with the Church militant and triumphant, the holy empire of which the new Jeruſalem is the metropolis.

Conſidering it as the kingdom of Chriſtianity in the *real* and *perſonal* acceptation it is *viſible and inviſible*.

As the viſible chriſtian church, it includes all who own the one faith, and confeſs Jeſus Chriſt to be Lord. Men become the ſubjects of it under this conſideration by faith and baptiſm, or a birth of water, or the waſhing of regeneration. In this view it is compared to wiſe and fooliſh virgins, a field of wheat and tares, a net repleniſhed with good and bad fiſhes, &c.

But as the kingdom of ſaving chriſtianity, including the goods of it, its conſtituitive eſſence is, " Truth, righteouſneſs, peace, and joy, in or by the Holy Ghoſt :" Rom. xiv. 7. And is compared to treaſure hid in a field, to a goodly pearl, &c. The poſſeſſors of it are the poor in ſpirit, like to little children : under this notion Chriſt tells a ſcribe he was not far from it, enjoins all to ſeek it, and its righteouſneſs firſt, and recommends a holy violence in taking it.

Sometimes the chriſtian church as viſible, and ſaving ſanctity, are both included in the kingdom of God ; and in this reſpect it is compared to a grain of muſtard ſeed, and to leaven ; Matt. xiii. 31, 32. the Scribes and Phariſees ſhut it up ; Chriſt gave the keys of it to his Apoſtles. Matt. xxiii. 13. and xvi. 19. John iii. 5. Matt. xviii. 23. In this ſenſe Chriſt threatens to take it from the Jews, Paul preached it and teſtified it. As erected by ſupernatural means, it is adminiſtered not in word but in power. 1. Cor. iv. 20. It is a vaſtly great polity, comprehending the catholic church in heaven and earth. In creating it by Chriſt, God is the founder of a mighty empire, an ornamental ſyſtem, a divine city.

A city is not a rude multitude, or herd of people, but a body politic like the body natural, which hath the *figure and beauty* of a man. Iſai. xliv. 13. It is built and united into one whole by a ſettlement of rights, and a fixed conſtitution, determining who ſhall reign and who be ſubject, &c. without which there can be no juſtice or government. The church conſtitutes this kingdom *perſonally*, and is conſtituted by it, conſidered *really*, i. e. by the grace and ſanctity of it. The deſcriptive marks of it are ſuch as theſe following.

1. It is new, not old, founded by the new, and not the firſt creation of God treated of Chap. 2. it is alſo mediatorial, not original.

Theſe characters of it are of ſingular note, for in the firſt and

original kingdom of God there was no Trinity, no Mediator, or official Renewer and Sanctifier. All iſſued from God as mere creator, and he was all in all in the government: no ſin exiſted, all were of one whole, all were holy and happy. A Mediator is not of one, and to ſuppoſe rationals created at firſt, ſo as to need an inter-agent between their maker and them, is not reaſonable. The holy moral law was the conſtitution of that kingdom, a covenant of life, ſubſiſting between God and his holy ſubjects. All had domicilium in urbe, a manſion in the city, no prodigal had left his Father's houſe, or ſheep ſtrayed from the fold of the Supreme Shepherd. God created none loſt ſo as to need a Saviour. The adminiſtration was without ſovereign grace, according to legal juſtice, and the law continued life to the unlapſed, while obeyed. Devils were of this original kingdom before they ſinned, and left their own habitation; Then they had not left their firſt eſtate, nor were the heavens unclean in God's ſight, nor theſe angels charged with folly. Human ſpirits were alſo ſubjects of that kingdom, and lapſed from it, as appears from their coming into this world loſt, and needing renovation and reſtoration to what had been. This was the ſtate of Adam in natural innocency, as needing the tree of life, a type of Chriſt, and this is now the ſtate of all his natural deſcendants as ſoon as born into our world. The original kingdom of God being thus divided, there was an abſolute neceſſity of a new Creation and conſtitution of it, if any rebels or revolters were reſtored, for there was no law that could give the tranſgreſſor life. In that kingdom all were *native ſaints* and no proviſion was made for *ſaints factive* of ſinners. But the preſent kingdom of heaven is the conſtitution of all things conſtitutively made new, and the ſtanding of all in it is of ſaints *factive*, for even holy angels are analogically reconciled, and created by Chriſt as thrones, dominions, principalities and powers, which are offices and officers, in the preſ-

ent, not the original kingdom of God. This kingdom that now is, upon the original lapſe, was foreordained to come in Chriſt, before the foundation of the world, this world and all things in and of it, were created to bring this foreordination to paſs. And all the ſpiritual and eternal concerns of men ever ſince the world was made, have been adminiſtered by God, with reference to this kingdom, and according to the conſtitution and law of it, as thereafter to be completely eſtabliſhed when the kingdom ſhould come. The law of grace virtually exiſted from the beginning of our world, but the kingdom itſelf was not *creatively* made until the reſurrection of Chriſt. In the New Teſtament in Chriſt's blood, a new ſettlement of things is made, including angels as well as men. And the kingdom of heaven is become *new in its foundation, ſovereignty, conſtitution, adminiſtration, ſubjects*, and all that belongs to it, and will ſo continue until Chriſt ſhall deliver up the kingdom to him from whom he received it, and all things revert to their original ſtate. Chriſtianity, by which God's kingdom is now founded, is to angels *religio confirmans, a confirming religion*, and *new* to both. "Chriſt died, ſaith Fulgentius, to confirm angels that they might not ſin, and to reſtore men who had ſinned." The goſpel kingdom is properly a middle kingdom, between the original and final kingdom of God all in all.

2. This kingdom of God, Chriſt and Heaven, ſtands diſtinguiſhed from all kingdoms of God ſo called, and in particular from the Jewiſh theocracy.

God never had any other kingdom but this ſince this world was created. The world itſelf was made, and all the economies of nature and providence, and every diſpenſation of religion antecedent to the eſtabliſhment of chriſtianity, were ſubordinate to this kingdom of heaven. The Moſaic Creation did not found the kingdom of God either as original or mediatorial, but was ſubſequent to the former, and introductory to the

latter. Adam's ſtanding in paradiſe was not in or of it, for he was only a natural man, not having the ſpirit, conſiſting of fleſh and blood, which do not inherit the kingdom of God. All the ſubjects of this kingdom are born into it of the ſpirit, and what is born of the ſpirit, is ſpirit.

And as to the Jewiſh theocracy, it was of this world, not of heaven, as its worldly ſanctuary ſhews, Heb. ix. 1. and only a figure of this heavenly polity and government. Solomon indeed is ſaid to ſit upon the throne of the kingdom of the Lord over Iſrael: I. Chron. xxviii. 5. and God is called their King, and Jeruſalem the city of the great King, Zeph. iii. 15. Matt. v. 15. and the Jews ſtill pray "Let thy kingdom reign over us forever." God did once reign over them in a peculiar manner, and they were in covenant with him, as a people with their king. He made their laws, governed them by his miniſters, received their tribute, fought their battles, dwelt among them, walked in their camp, and they are called a kingdom of prieſts, that is a ſacerdotal polity of regial quality. Exod. xix. 6. But all this did not conſtitute them the kingdom of God in the goſpel ſenſe. Canaan was not heaven: they were only a commonwealth until Saul came to reign. God is now as really King of nations as he was of them. Their kingdom, religion and national church, were of this world, not of heaven, only typically. Whatever of ſpiritual and heavenly bleſſings were derived to the Jews, they came not by the law, but the *promiſe* relating to the goſpel kingdom, to which the law was added to ſerve civil, national, and worldly purpoſes. Their national church was only typical of the chriſtian church, as was alſo their covenant. The new covenant was not made, until the blood of Chriſt was ſhed. If the covenant of circumciſion had been the covenant of grace, the ſecond covenant would have been more than four hundred years prior to the firſt, for the firſt was made at Sinai. The root and fatneſs of

the olive tree, Gentiles partake of by engrafting into the church with the Jews, relates not to their national church, founded on the covenant of circumcision, but to the church of ſpiritual Jews founded on the belief of that abſolute promiſe made to Abraham before he was circumciſed. Rom. iv. 10. As all ſacrificers in faith before the law were Jews without the name: ſo all believers in the promiſe before Chriſt came, were chriſtians without the name. The kingdom of God therefore over Iſrael, was only a typical, ſhadowy, and worldly repreſentation of the kingdom of God, Chriſt, and Heaven, of which the Chriſtian Trinity are the perſonal ſovereignty. There was no triune adminiſtration of the Jewiſh government, no inſpired or uninſpired Jews were Trinitarians. They had no Mediator between God and them but Moſes a ſervant. The law was by the diſpoſition of angels: God had not then ſpoken by his Son, to men: nor were there any appearances in old teſtament times, of Him, who was then to come.

3. The kingdom of God, and of Chriſt, is diſtinguiſhed from, and independent of all human worldly kingdoms.

It's names import it to be divine, chriſtian, and heavenly in its origin, ſovereignty, conſtitution, laws, and ſubjects. Chriſt who was the Lord from heaven ſaith, "My kingdom is not of this world." John xviii 26. Worldly kingdoms have another origin. Dan. vii. 3. There is nothing in this kingdom to feed men's worldly ambition: the refined arts of human policy, which thrive in other kingdoms, are cramped in this. The world hates God, Chriſt and chriſtians, becauſe not of it and becauſe they teſtify of the world that its deeds are evil. God and Chriſt are not of the world's choice or liking. To be in and of this world is to be without God, and without Chriſt and their kingdom. Worldly kingdoms are *civil political*, or at beſt *civil religious* polities: but this is *ſpiritual religious*. They are claimed by worldly deſcent, by conqueſt with car-

nal weapons, or the election of worldly men, and reſpect worldly and bodily mothers, and even the religion of worldly kingdoms, is of this world. Every national church, the Jewiſh not excepted, is of this world. This kingdom is entered by a heavenly birth, gained by a ſpiritual warfare, and its rights and privileges accrue by a divine creation. The kingdoms of this world are maintained by wealth, governed by worldly policy and maxims not always juſt, defended by ſtrength of armies, and their nobles "glare in gems and ſhine in gold." But in this kingdom all is the reverſe. The higheſt office in it, which is of a biſhop or preſbyter, is a work, or labor, the ſubjects are volunteers called out of the world, their enemies, graces, ornaments, are heavenly or ſpiritual. It is the kingdom of the croſs, founded on it, and erected by the preaching of it. And it is independent of all worldly kingdoms; no human king or magiſtrate, as ſuch, hath the leaſt authority in it. Chriſt's miniſters, as ſuch, might juſt as well exerciſe juriſdiction in the kingdoms of men. A king, if of the church, is as much ſubject to the diſcipline of the church, according to the laws of Chriſt the prince of the kings of the earth, as the meaneſt brother. And the higheſt eccleſiaſtic is equally amenable to juſt civil authority, as any other man. There are no *ſpiritual lords* in Chriſt's kingdom but himſelf: no *lords biſhops*, or *lords preſbyters*, or *high and mighty lords, brethren*. How little hath the nature of Chriſt's kingdom been known, and how different hath been the prevailing ſpirit among thoſe called by his name, from what it ought to have been? It hath in a degree been made a worldly polity, ever ſince the days of Conſtantine: and the chriſtian religion hath by ſome been made an engine of ſtate, and its ſacraments civil teſts. Men have been dragooned into religion, or to a compliance with ſtupid edicts of paſſive obedience, and not reſiſtance to the violators of the rights of man, and

the chriſtian, hath been oppreſſed with power, perſecution, and a barbarous inquiſition. The Luciferian pride of eccleſiaſtics, not of Chriſt's making, hath been unbounded; ſuch as Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Archbiſhops, Dioceſan Biſhops, as an order above Preſbyters, &c. all creatures of this world. The Patriarch of Alexandria ſtyles himſelf "Judge of the world." And the dignity of biſhop, is by Roman authors, made equal or ſuperior to the imperial.

Euſebia, the Empreſs, ſent for Leontius the biſhop of Tripoli to come to her. He made anſwer, that if he came, the reverence due to biſhops muſt be preſerved. "When I enter you muſt come down from your ſublime throne, and reverently come to meet me, and put your head under my hands to receive my benediction; then I muſt ſit, and you modeſtly ſtand, until by a ſign I give you leave to ſit. If you like theſe conditions, I will come, if not, you can do nothing for me that will compenſate for the neglect of the honor due to biſhops, and the violation of the divine inſtitutes of the prieſthood."

Contraſt this with the temper and conduct of the meek and lowly Jeſus, and of his Apoſtles: how ſtriking the difference! By ſuch ignorance of the nature of Chriſt's kingdom, biſhops became proud, and princes tame to bear any burdens ſubmiſſive as aſſes, to have their necks trod upon, and to kiſs the toe of the foot that honored them with its preſſure. Their tyrannical dominations, puſly grandeur, worldly pomp, outrageous contentions for preeminence, bloody diſputes at their elections, furious perſecutions, lordly uſurpations over preſbyters, their equals, depriving them of the power of ordination and government, fill eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, and the half is not written. See the canons of the councils of Nice, Chalcedon, &c. for the exaltation of Metropolitans, Patriarchs, and Biſhops, ſome of whom could not write their names, but ſigned by others, or made their marks. Fit perſons for us to take our creeds from.

What furious *beaſts* were the monks, and others at Alexandria, who murdered that excellent mathematician, Hypatia, the daughter of Theon, tore her in pieces and burnt her members! and who alſo killed Proterius, the biſhop, drew his body, torn to pieces, through the city, then burnt it, and threw the aſhes into the air, a fit ſacrifice for infernals to make to their God, the prince of the power of the air! Ignorance of the nature of Chriſt's kingdom ſtill continues, though not to the production of ſuch tragical effects. For becauſe Chriſt's kingdom is not of this world, the kingdoms of the world have ſet themſelves againſt his ſubjects, to deprive them of natural and civil rights merely upon that account, witneſs the conſtitutions and laws of ſome ſtates to deprive the miniſters of Chriſt of any civil rights.

4. This kingdom ſtands directly oppoſed to Satan's worldly kingdom. The devil hath had a kingdom in the world even from the beginning of it, and it is likely even from before its preſent adornation, and as he aimed to be, ſo he is the god of it. His kingdom of this world comprehends all without the church, and kingdom of God. To the one, or the other of theſe all rationals belong. To oppoſe this kingdom, Chriſt's kingdom was erected, and to deſtroy his works the Son of God was manifeſted. The ſcience of ſanctity cannot be well underſtood without ſome knowledge of ſatan's worldly kingdom. By their firſt birth men are in, and of it, and by a new birth, they paſs from under the power of darkneſs, and enter the kingdom of God's dear Son. The characteriſtics of Satan's kingdom are darkneſs, falſhood, and wickedneſs. But as it had a beginning it muſt have an end: God will not ſuffer an eternal blemiſh in his works: Chriſt will reign until every oppoſing power is ſubdued, and every enemy deſtroyed, the laſt enemy is death, conſequential to the deſtruction of him that hath the power of death, that is the devil. 1. Cor. xv. 26. Heb. ii. 14.

5. The positive characters of this kingdom, descriptive of its nature, though very many, are easily deducible from its names, and from what hath been already written of it.

As God's kingdom it is divine, as Christ's it is christian, and under both names, it is holy, spiritual and heavenly, in its supreme, and mediatorial head, and in its subjects, goods, promises, graces and privileges. The kingdom of the regenerate or new created by Christ, or the city of regeneration, as St. Augustine calls it. It is peopled by a generation from above. Being new and divine it is the church of the *first born*, which denotes its dignity and nobility. Heb. xii. 22. Even angels have the thing which regeneration is, a birth of God without our mode, by being *reborn*. It is a kingdom of grace, truth, love, righteousness, peace, joy, &c.

6. The church militant on earth, which is an essential part of this kingdom, is like to the character of the holy scriptures, *holy popular*.

By nature all men are one people, God's offspring, of one flesh and blood, possessed of *equal rights*. These are cantonized into families, tribes, nations, and empires. The people's safety and happiness is the public good. A people are combined together by a common law or by common utility and interest. "Where there is no law, justice, or right, there is no people."

In scripture, *people*, is used in a magnifying sense for a *polity*. "Ephraim shall be broken that he be not a people." The Jews are now no people. Sometimes people signify an ecclesiastical popular community. Rom. x. 19. I. Pet. ii. 10.

The people were held in abhorrence by the philosophers. But in all the important concerns of mankind, the people have the greatest interest as being *the many*. The welfare of the people demands the greatest attention. The people are capable of the greatest and best things: God and Christ have

manifeſted the greateſt love for them. Biſhop Taylor remarks "That good women of the common ſort" were favored with the firſt ſight of our raiſed Savior. The dignity of the people's nature, their relation to God, cognation to all, equality to any, their uſefulneſs to the higheſt, ſhew their importence and worth. Chriſt makes no difference between the ſouls of the rich and the poor, higheſt and loweſt, nor ſhould his miniſters. The meaneſt if born of God are ennobled. God's people are *holy* and *peculiar*. I. Pet. ii. 9. The pooreſt have equal rights in God's kingdom with a king on his throne. The greateſt potentate, being a chriſtian, is no more than a private brother in the church. All are the people as to Chriſt. Now that this kingdom is *popular* in the above ſenſe, appears from the character of the holy ſcriptures, which is the *people's book of religion*, written for them, and is of univerſal concernment. It is the life of every ſoul. Human ſociety cannot exiſt without ſome *kind of religion*. Religion is the proper indiſpenſable *ſtudy*, *own work*, and *buſineſs of every man*. The goſpel invites all the people, Chriſt died for all alike. It is read by the people as the *law of their life*. Its motives are accommodated to their natural love of life, and according to their heart's deſire it brings them *life*.

This kingdom is popular as oppoſed to *abſolute ſovereignty*, that is the deſpotic, arbitrary will of another, without a *charter of rights*. The government of God and Chriſt is not arbitrary, tyrannical, but juſt and happy: that of a father over children, a ſhepherd over his ſheep, a huſband over his ſpouſe, and is full of manſuetude and graciouſneſs. There is a *covenant to the people*, a charter of their immunities and liberties: and they are treated as freemen, not as ſlaves. As in other free ſtates, ſo in this, the people chooſe God and Chriſt to be their God and Savior, and their officers under them, and are a willing covenant people. God's decrees are edicts publiſhed,

no ſecret purpoſes, and are terminated upon no ſpecified characters. Ungodly men are ordained to condemnation: ſanctified believers are choſen to eternal life. Where people are diſtinguiſhed from their paſtors, they are conſidered as the Lord's people, and may not be lorded over as to their faith by miniſters, nor may they lord it over miniſters' faith. They may chooſe their officers in this kingdom, as was done in the free ſtates of Greece, by lifting up their hands, in the choice of their magiſtrates. The *church*, the *brethren*, the *faithful*, are names for the people. The people *elect*, but do not *inveſt* in office, or convey the *authority*, *that* comes from Chriſt the *ſole Head* by his ordinance: and the ordainers under Chriſt cannot limit or reſtrict the authority, nor extend it farther than Chriſt's law doth. Nor can the ordained ſtipulate for leſs power than Chriſt hath given: it is a nullity. The paſtor executes Chriſt's laws with the brethren's conſent. As men with their magiſtrates make one *civil people*, ſo the fraternity with their paſtors make *one eccleſiaſtical people*. St. Auguſtine calls the flock of Chriſt, conſiſting of miniſters, deacons, and brethren in particular, *a holy popular commonwealth*. A kingdom is a body of people profeſſing ſubjection to one ſovereign Head, ſo is the church with reſpect to Chriſt the one Lord. And as civil kingdoms conſiſt of leſſer particular ſyſtems, or corporations, ſo doth the church catholic conſiſt of particular churches compoſed of paſtors and their flocks. But in the Church there is no one common, human authority over the whole, making it one viſible corporation, nor over a part as in a nation or ſtate. Rulers in one church have no authority in another. The power of œcumenical councils, national ſynods, provincial preſbyteries, county conſociations, is really none at all. Theſe are human inventions, and as to any juriſdiction which they have it is uſurped.

The name of a city given to the church, ſhews it to be

popular. For a city is a ſettled *polity* by an act of incorporation, which is its creation as a city. All citizens are enrolled freemen, have equal right to elect, or be elected, if qualified, into office, to give their conſent to the admiſſion of members, and in caſe of delinquency, to be judged by their peers according to law. And thus it is in the church, city, or kingdom of God. Other ſocieties may and ought to be religious, but this only is made a politic ſociety by religion. The *pact* between God, Chriſt, and their people, is the *holy new covenant*, and all in covenant are in ſtate, and by profeſſion *holy*.

The name *eccleſia*, church, as well as *city*, hath ſomething popular in it, for it doth not ſignify an aſſembly of chief men, as a *ſenate*, but a number of all ſorts, believing in the common Savior, none of whom are excluded from it, by the lowneſs of their condition. If *pride* was lawful, the meaneſt member of Chriſt's church might ſo be proud of his full equality as a brother to the greateſt potentate on earth, and of his ſuperiority to any who are not brethren in Chriſt. But in the church of Chriſt they riſe by humility.

The church of Chriſt is not conſtituted after the model of the temple Hierarchy, but correſpondent to the civil polity of the Jews. It hath the name of the twelve tribes, Rev. vii. was founded by twelve apoſtles, who anſwer to the twelve patriarchs, and twelve princes of the tribes, I. Chron. xxviii. 1. who were next in dignity to the king, and ſat about the throne in twelve chairs. But they did not as a common authority govern the twelve tribes, but each Prince his own tribe. Chriſt did not ſet the apoſtles, or their ſucceſſors, over the church to govern it by their joint authority, but each kept in his own line, as each Prince did in his own circuit. Each city had its ſenate, and the Apoſtles ordained elders in every city to guide and rule the church in it.

As judges and rulers were made by the impoſition of hands, ſo are preſbyters, who are goſpel biſhops. I. Tim. iv. 14. That

the government of the church is holy popular, like to that of old Iſrael its type: yet with this difference, they being of one nation, dwelling in the ſame land, had a ſupreme court of ſeventy elders to appeal to, but not ſo the church which was to ſpread over all nations. Chriſt choſe ſeventy diſciples and ſent them among the *Jews*, and then laid them aſide, and never made a common authority over all chriſtians, as the ſeventy were over the Jews. *Epiſcopalian lordſhip*, and *Preſbyterian ariſtocracy*, have no foundation in ſcripture.

God's kingdom and church hath alſo the name of a *houſe* and *family*, which denotes it to be popular. Chriſtians of aliens and foreigners are made fellow-citizens of the ſaints and of the houſehold of God.

7. The kingdom of God is but one, though of great extent.

The chriſtian Trinity is one undivided ſovereignty, with one *name*, faith or religion. Angels and human ſaints make but one family, houſehold, city, holy polity of ſaints. Eph. iii. 15. and ii. 9. Eph. i. 10. Rev. xv. 3. Heb. xii. 22. There may be a circumſtantial difference between things in earth and things in heaven; yet angels are of the ſame religion that chriſtians are, and worſhip Chriſt ſince his reſurrection. He is the head of both and they are complete in him. As a kingdom is no inferior polity, ſo this is of great amplitude. There are an innumerable company of angels, who as much exceed devils in number, as the loyal ſubjects of a well governed kingdom exceed the malefactors in its priſons. The holy writers pretend not to define their numbers when they call them *legions*, *thouſands of thouſands*, *ten thouſand times ten thouſands*, and *myriads*.

St. Auguſtine ſuppoſes there are ten thouſand myriads of angels above ten hundred thouſand of arch angels, thrones alſo, and dominions, principalities, and powers without number. And as to the human ſubjects of it, they have been many, and will be more before the times of the reſtitution of all things.

At the end this kingdom ſhall be emptied into the kingdom of God all in all : and there will be no oppoſite kingdom to God alone. Such is the kingdom of our God, and of his Chriſt.

There is one obvious inference from the premiſes, viz. That the firſt chriſtian duty is to become ſubjects of this kingdom of God.

As in human kingdoms men are made ſubjects in ſtate and relation, and then become bound to obſerve the laws of the polity : for ſo prince and people firſt confederate, and then do the duties of their relation : ſo we take God for our God, Chriſt for our Savior, enter their kingdom, and then obſerve the laws of it. "As ye have received Chriſt Jeſus the Lord ſo walk ye in him." Coloſ. ii. 6. "All the ten commandments, ſaith Luther, are radically contained in the firſt, in taking God for our God." In reſpect of the benefit and duty of Chriſtians, "Baptiſm is to me, ſaith Baſil, the beginning of life." The kingdom of God, conſidered as the kingdom of ſaving Chriſtianity, is propoſed to our acceptance and purchaſe : and ought to be ſought for firſt, and even to be taken with a holy violence. And three is good reaſon for our utmoſt exertion upon account of the worth of its goods, which no time can bound, cogitation fathom, arithmetic compute, or words come up to the dimenſions of them.

## CHAP. XI.

### OF REGENERATION.

*The way of entering the kingdom of God by regeneration of ſtate and nature, deſcribed.*

THE founder of this kingdom declares that "Except any one be born of water and of the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John iii. 5. And this is parallel to

thoſe words, "According to his mercy he ſaved us, by the waſhing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt." Tit. iii. 5. It is obvious to remark that men are not natively or by their firſt birth in and of this kingdom: for then another birth to enter it would be unneceſſary: and alſo that God never created rationals aliens from his kingdom, for that would have been in effect to make them ſubjects of Satan's kingdom. Adam's ſtanding in paradiſe was not in this kingdom, being only a natural earthy man.

The Moſaic creation founded no kingdom of God and heaven. All rationals have been proved before, to have been originally of God's kingdom, and that men are now natively without it, and are candidates for reduction into it, but not for reſtoration to any thing poſſeſſed by the firſt Adam: He needed regeneration into the kingdom of God as much as we now do, and neither he nor any of his deſcendants could enter this divine kingdom, either by a birth of *blood*, or being born of the *will of the fleſh*, or of the *will of man*. John i. 13. A natural birth cannot enter any into a ſpiritual kingdom, fleſh and blood though innocent could not enter it, I. Cor. xv. 50. much leſs can a birth *of ſinful fleſh*. Eph. ii. 3. And if Adam had never departed from innocence, a *birth of the will of man*, could not have entered his deſcendants into this divine and heavenly kingdom. When Solomon ſaith, God hath made man upright, it doth not imply holineſs, or divine animation, but a rectitude of human nature, which is ſhort of a participation of the divine nature, the only thing that will introduce any into this divine kingdom. No act proceeding from one kind of life can produce the principle of another kind of life. The moſt perfect acts of a brute cannot make him partaker of the human nature: nor can the moſt perfect human acts, be productive as a cauſe of the divine nature. Holy exerciſes cannot proceed from the human nature, until it is renewed

into the divine life. A thing muſt firſt be, and then act: "Make the tree good and the fruit will be good." As the kingdom of God muſt be entered before the duty of ſubjects can be performed: ſo the mode of entrance is by *a birth of water and of the ſpirit*. Theſe ſignify not the ſame thing, any more than *the waſhing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghoſt*, mean the ſame thing.

1. A birth of water, or the waſhing of regeneration, is what viſibly enters us into the viſible kingdom of God.

As to be born of water and of the ſpirit is the ſame as being born *again*, or from *above*: John iii. 7. So the birth of water in particular, is the ſame with being baptized with water agreeable to the chriſtian inſtitution. Regeneration or the new birth is the buſineſs, end and deſign of baptiſm, of which the new covenant is the ſubſtance. Baptiſm is a viſible regeneration, changing the *viſible ſtate* of a perſon, as his ſtate is changed at his birth: for then he enters upon a new mode of being in a new region: and his *real ſtate* is changed alſo, if the thing ſignified accompanies the ſign, as it doth in the *offer* of it, and in the *effect*, where the ſubject is not faulty. Baptiſm formerly went by the names of *regeneration, the ſacrament of ſanctification*, the *vital laver*, the *vital water*, the *ſecond nativity*, the *ſalutary nativity*, and the *beginning of life*. St. Cyprian ſaith, "The chriſtian's nativity is in baptiſm." But moderns have affixed an idea of their own to regeneration, and will not allow of baptiſmal regeneration, in their ſenſe meaning ſaving renovation or converſion, which is not fact as to all the baptized. But St. Paul's calling baptiſm the *waſhing of regeneration*, ſeems to infer ſome kind of baptiſmal regeneration. Men thereby become viſible members of the viſible church, have the name of chriſtians, and are under all chriſtian engagements which their age and capacity will admit of, and ſhould be treated as children, ſaints and ſubjects. Who are the ſubjects of baptiſm

hath been diſputed. Some confine it to adult believers, others extend it to their infant offſpring, which hath been validly proved to be agreeable to ſcripture: But the otherwiſe minded muſt be fully perſuaded in their minds, and act accordingly until God reveal this alſo unto them. We only obſerve that in order to the validity of baptiſm it ought to be adminiſtered by a viſibly authoriſed perſon, as well as into the name of the Chriſtian Trinity. And therefore lay baptiſm is invalid.

2. The birth of the ſpirit conſtitutes us *real* ſubjects of the kingdom of God.

By the ſpirit we are undoubtedly to underſtand the Holy Spirit, ſince Jeſus the firſt born, was born of the Holy Ghoſt. A birth ſuppoſes a previous generation. God begets us with the word of truth, and we are born again or above, not of corruptible, but incorruptible ſeed, by the word of God. James i. 18. I. Pet. i. 23. What is born of the ſpirit, *is ſpirit*, vital ſanctity.

Regeneration is two fold, of ſtate and of nature; the ſubject of it is the man born into our world, as the being born *again* implies. But ſince the ſpirit of man was not originated by a birth into our world, not the phyſical being of the ſoul, neither its eſſential faculties are changed by regeneration. But a vital principle of ſanctity is infuſed, and the ſubjects of it are quickened into life, and become babes in Chriſt, and grow up like the Holy Jeſus to the perfect ſtature of men. Without life there is no generation, or regeneration: the Spirit gives life to ſoul and body, and renews us alſo in the ſpirit of our minds, and illuminates with the light of life. Regeneration hath a beginning, but the product of it is not perfected at once. Enoch was perfectly regenerated when he was tranſlated, ſo was Elijah when he entered the chariot of fire, for fleſh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor doth corruption inherit incorruption. The appearance of Moſes and

Elias on the Mount was in bodies perfectly regenerated. It was the regenerated life of God within him made Moſes's face to ſhine, and Stephen's face to appear like that of an angel. It is the indwelling of the ſpirit in the ſaints that quickens their mortal bodies, and raiſes them ſpiritual and glorious, and completes their regeneration.

The term *regeneration* is founded in Judaiſm, heatheniſm, among politicians, and phyſicians, and lawyers, &c. which reſemblances may ſerve to illuſtrate the ſcripture notion of it, as not relating to mind but life and ſubſtance, or ſtate and condition.

Selden and Marſham tell us that the Jews looked upon their proſelytes as new born, when baptized, even as infants newly come into the world. They ſuppoſed all their former kindred ceaſed with their Gentiliſm, and that none of their relations by affinity or conſanguinity, could inherit their eſtates after their deceaſe: and even their former marriage they thought to be diſſolved, but the Apoſtle reſtifies that error. I. Cor. vii. 13, 14, &c. At that time they were thought to put off their country, and to have a new ſoul from heaven. Analogous to this by the chriſtian regeneration there is a new ſet of ſpiritual relations formed, the natural continuing as they were: they change their ſtate and country, by paſſing out of darkneſs into light, from Satan's kingdom into that of God's dear Son, and from being citizens of this world to become citizens of heaven. They are therefore new men or new creatures, in nature and ſtate.

Heathen had a kind of regeneration by their initiation into the Eleuſinian myſteries, paſſing through many purgations and five years preparatory trial: at which time they engaged to reliquiſh their former and take up a new way of living, and bound themſelves to the practice of greater piety and humanity than others. Theſe myſteries were called the *principle*

*of life*, which ſpeaks them to be a regeneration. See Grotius on John iii. 5. Tertullian ſaith, "The Gentiles are tinged at certain ſacred times, for a regeneration and the impunity of their perjuries." Among the Greeks the long abſent, or ſuppoſed dead, for whom funeral rights had been performed, upon their return or revival, were looked upon as born again.

Among politicians, the new creation of the conſtitution of a ſtate, and declaration of its independence is a regeneration. *Then a nation is born at once.* Iſa. lxvi. &c.

Phyſicians call the reſtoration of loſt fleſh by a new growth, a regeneration.

Philoſophers call the reducing things to their firſt eſtate, a regeneration.

The ſtoics and Platonics held to ſuch a regeneration of the world. And Chriſt ſpeaks of following him in the regenerations, in the new ſtate of things, Matt. xix. 28.

Lawyers ſpeak of a regeneration of great note: which is when a bond ſlave is fully manumiſſed, and made a citizen, as though he was free born. This is a regeneration of ſtate, and ſo is adoption into a family.

Cicero terms a reſtoration to his country and honors, a regenerating of him.

"If a man is delivered from the danger of death, let him look upon himſelf as born again." Firmicus. "I ſeem to be born again, to have new life," (ſaith Hegio in Plautus,) when he heard his captive ſon was come home.

The reſurrection of the body being a reviviſcence is a regeneration. Heb. i. 5. comp. I. Pet. ii. 3. Pſ. ii. 7.

The redemption of the body, and the deliverance of the creature ſubject to vanity, from the bondage of corruption, is its *adoption*, which is a regeneration of ſtate. Rom. viii. 19, 20, &c. They are begotten and born into a life of glory, and are ſons of God being ſons of the reſurrection.

As to chriſtian regeneration of *ſtate*, it is to be obſerved that the firſt entrance into a new mode of exiſtence in a new region is a *birth*, and the perſon who thus enters, is born into it, and if any rite or thing is uſed to effect this birth, He may be ſaid to be born of *that*. Thus by the application of *water* agreeable to the chriſtian inſtitution, to adults or infants, they change their ſtate, and begin a new being in a new world. They paſs out of Satan's into Chriſt's kingdom, become his ſubjects, the adoptive ſons and daughters of God, and are no more aliens, ſtrangers, or foreigners, but fellow citizens of the ſaints, and of the houſehold of God. They are in that region where the Holy Spirit uſually acts, enjoy the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and the patronage of angels of no mean dignity, *who always behold the face of their father in heaven*. Matt. xviii. 10. Eſth. i. 4. The waſhing of regeneration compriſeth the *remiſſion of ſins*: Acts xxii. 16. therefore the ſtate of remiſſion of ſins, adoption, and divine citizenſhip, may be called *regeneration of ſtate*, as reſtitutio natalium, or the manumitting a ſlave with plenary ingenuity, is by the imperial lawyers called regeneration. As the ſtate of things under Chriſt is called *the regeneration*; Matt. xix. 28. ſo that ſtate of rights and relations conferred on chriſtians, upon their admiſſion into the kingdom of God, muſt be conſidered as part of their regeneration.

"God hath taken us into his kingdom by the adoption of ſacred regeneration." St. Ambroſe. This kingdom is conſtituted by regeneration of *ſtate*, for therein conſiſteth the manumitting ſlaves, the endenizing citizens, naturalizing aliens, and adopting ſons. "By the adoption of regeneration we are born of God." St. Auguſtine. The grace of adoption is conferred in our ſecond nativity, which is part of regeneration, and is our ennoblement of ſtate and condition, a paſſing from the loyal ſtate under ſervitude, bondage and condemnation, into the

ſtate of grace, liberty, and ſalvation, from the ſtate of death, to that of life. This is *viſibly* and *ſignificatively* effected by the birth of water, and *really* by the birth of the Spirit accompanying it. The water in baptiſm is the antitype, to the water in Noah's flood, *that* was ſalvivic to him and family, *this* is to believers and their houſeholds. I. Pet. iii. 2. They are *the ſaved ones*. And this birth of water is ordinarily as neceſſary in its place, as the birth of the Spirit, and the previous exiſtence of the latter, doth not render the former needleſs.

*Regeneration of nature* is no more *figurative* than the firſt generation and birth is.

It is the communication and addition of the divine nature and life, to the *creature* to whom the goſpel is commanded to be preached. The product of a birth of the ſpirit, *is ſpirit*, a vital ſubſtance, and not a rational ſoul. The account given of the generation and nativity of Jeſus the Son of God, will explain our regeneration of nature; for he was born of the ſame ſpirit we are *reborn*. He the *firſt born*, we the *many brethren*; he the natural, creature-tranſcendant Son of God, we the adopted creature Sons of God. As his intellect or ſpirit was not then originated, but a divine vital ſubſtance united to it, ſubject to a progreſs and growth towards perfection: ſo neither is our ſpirit originated by our natural generation or birth, but comes from God, and is made partaker of fleſh and blood, to which a divine vital nature is added in our regeneration, ſubject to a natural progreſs and growth, until we arrive to a *perfect man unto the meaſure of the ſtature of the fullneſs of Chriſt*. Eph. iv. 13. Regeneration of nature therefore eſſentially conſiſts in the communication, and participation of the divine vital nature which is life eternal in holineſs and love, and is called *incorruptible ſeed*, I. Pet. i. 23. and is compared to a grain of muſtard ſeed, for its mighty growth, hence the born of God have *his ſeed remaining in them*. I. John iii. 9. This princi-

ple of life and divine animation is what the *heart* is to the natural man, and is called a *new heart*, a *new creature*, and *new man*. All the moral changes in the world without life, do not amount to regeneration of nature. The dead in treſpaſſes and ſins, the alienated from the life of God, are made *alive*, and *live* unto God. Chriſt came that we might have life, he is the life, God hath given us eternal life in him, and he is our life, hid with Chriſt in God. Chriſt is made a quickening ſpirit, as the firſt man was made a living ſoul to communicate life to the children, God hath given him, of which he is the everlaſting Father. Speaking of the ſpirit (he ſaith) "he ſhall receive of mine, and ſhew it unto you."

Of his fulneſs we receive by the ſpirit and grace for grace. By his ſpirit the mortal bodies of ſaints are quickened. The Spirit born of Spirit is light, love, and holineſs, a vital inſtinct and conſtitution, the vital ſubſtance of Saints, as Saints, a comprehenſion of properties, having ſympathies, and antipathies, a principle of free motion, like the circulation of the blood, or a living ſtream from a living fountain. I. John i. 5. I. iv. 8. II. Pet. i. 4. Heb. xii. 10.

"Out of his belly ſhall flow rivers of living water." John vii. 38. As ants are taught to do after their kind; ſo the regenerate are taught of God, to love God, and to hate evil, with an antipathy like that of a lamb to a wolf, and cannot ſin, his ſeed remaining in them, becauſe they are born of God. I. John iii. 9. They are alſo inſtinctively *taught of God to love one another*. I. Theſ. iv. 9. The ſpirit born of ſpirit luſteth againſt the fleſh, and prevents their doing what the fleſh would have them to do. Gal. v. 17. It is for want of this ſpirit, the law of the mind in the unregenerate is too weak to hinder their being captivated to the law of ſin in their members. Rom. vii. 23. Fleſh and ſpirit will no more mix than oil and water. Fleſh is a vital nature ſpontaneouſly perturbing

of ſin, therefore called *ſinful* and they who are under its reign, and governed by the mind of the fleſh, are carried on in the ways of ſin, by a live impetus, *for the ſpirit of whoredom is in them.* Hoſea. v. 4. In a ſimilar manner the divine nature is a vital principle in the regenerate, ſetting them in motion towards God and holineſs, inclining them to holy duties with a willing propenſion, which they perform with a willing and ready mind, as not being grievous, for the ſpirit of God is and abideth in them. Their faith and love are holy, the product of a new heart. In proportion to their regeneration, holineſs is their life and pulſe, their very conſtitution as ſaints, and by degrees it works out the remainder of corruption, as *nature*, according to Hipocrates, *is a cure for all diſeaſes.* The divine nature is the foundation of all holy acts, *which are wrought in God.* John iii. 21. It is ſuperior to, and diſtinct from common human nature, and oppoſed to evil nature. To walk as men is to be carnal. I. Cor. iii. 3. *To ſhow ourſelves* men, is a laudable attainment, but regeneration makes us more than men, by the addition of the divine, to the human nature. It was the divine nature which is love, moved God to give his only begotten Son, and Jeſus who is love of love, voluntarily to come from heaven to earth to help us, by undergoing agonies for our eaſe, enduring ſtripes for our healing, and ſuffering ignominy and death for our honor and life. The divine nature is light without darkneſs, pure luminous vitality, abhorrent from all evil, all joyous, beauteous and lovely. "Thou art fair my love, altogether lovely, there is no ſpot in thee." It is endued with a celeſtial kind of *beauty through the comelineſs of God,* put upon the partakers of it. Ezek. xvi. 14. And as the holy offspring of the king of ſaints, the regenerate are endued with the holineſs of dignity as well as of purity. Their ſanctity is their divine nobility, excellency and honour, the righteous is more excellent than his neighbour.

The regenerate are alſo Zion's children, born of her, who travails in birth to bring them forth, and Jeruſalem above, is their mother. Lament. iv. 2. Iſai. lxvi. 8. Ps. lxxxvii. 5. The forming a child of grace, is like forming a child in the womb, and godly Miniſters travel in birth till it is effected. Gal. iv. 19. Though God begets us, and we are born of the ſpirit, yet the word, miniſters, and human exertions, concur herein.

We only obſerve that all chriſtian graces, duties, benefits, engagements and privileges, are conſequences and effects of regeneration. And that renovation in the ſpirit of the mind, illumination, converſion, putting off the old man, and putting on the new man, in the new Covenant, come under the ſame denomination. The neceſſity of divine regeneration ariſes from the conſtitution of God, the nature of the kingdom entered, and the utter impoſſibility of any's being happy without it.

This ſhould make every one to agonize to enter the kingdom of God by being born again, for without are the unclean, unholy and vile. Rev. xxii. 15.

## CHAP. XII.

### OF A TESTAMENT, COVENANT, AND LAW.

*Of a Teſtament, Covenant, and Law: of the old: of the new, compared: the new the better Teſtament: Chriſt the Mediator of the new: his mediation: all his offices mediatorial.*

CHRISTIANITY conſidered as the kingdom of God or Chriſt, and of Heaven, muſt have *a conſtitution* according to which it is ſettled, and governed, and a *charter* of rights declaring the dues of ſovereign and ſubjects. A regular kingdom cannot exiſt without ſuch a conſtitution, and there is always an implicit league or covenant between the ſovereign and ſubjects. What the conſtitution and law of this kingdom is,

none can be ignorant who conſider the kingdom itſelf is not *original but new*, that it is entered by a *new birth*, and we ſhall prove hereafter is alſo founded by a *new creation*. The very title affixed to the book which contains the chriſtian religion, *E Kaine Diatheke*, tranſlated the *New Teſtament*, imports it to be a *new ſettlement* of things. The old teſtament and new, the old law and the new, are not the ſame under different *editions*, any more than the old man and the new, are the ſame. Though we read of commandments both *old and new*: yet the *new* when materially the ſame with the old, are at the ſame time diſtinct from them, as enjoined by a new authority, as laws of a new kingdom, and containing either an addition of duty, or cauſes, meaſures, and motives of duty, to angels and men. The writer to the Hebrews ſaith, "For this cauſe he (Chriſt) is the Mediator of the new teſtament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the tranſgreſſions, that were under the firſt teſtament, they which are called might receive the promiſe of eternal inheritance." Heb. ix. 15. Here is a firſt and a new teſtament, the former is in other places called the old, and the latter the better teſtament eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes. Therefore they cannot be one and the ſame under different editions as ſome ſpeak. The firſt had no promiſe of eternal inheritance.

*The religions of Jews and Chriſtians, and the books that contain them, go under the name of Teſtaments.*

*It will be neceſſary to inquire into the nature of a* Teſtament *according to the force of the original word* E Diatheke: *to deſcribe the firſt or old: to conſider the nature of the ſecond or new: point out their differences upon compariſon, whence the new will appear to be the better: ſhew Chriſt to be the Mediator of the new, deſcribe his mediation in his ſeveral offices. The illuſtration of theſe particulars will give us an idea of the preſent conſtitution, and adminiſtration of the kingdom of heaven before deſcribed.*

1. The nature of a teſtament according to the force of the original words *E Diatheke*, is to be inquired into.

This word is tranſlated *covenant*, as well as teſtament, and it partakes of the nature of both a teſtament and a covenant, and alſo of a *law*.

The primary ſignification of Diatheke, is that of a politic diſpoſition or ſettlement of things. The Hebrew word anſwering to it, ſignifies to *make, ordain, and eſtabliſh*. Now both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian religions are conſtitutions, or ſettlements of things which God hath created, and eſtabliſhed; and ſuch ſettlements as have the name and nature of teſtaments, covenants, and laws, and therefore the word is uſed for all theſe ſorts of conſtitutions.

It ſometimes ſignifies a *teſtament* properly, and cannot be otherwiſe underſtood. "Where a teſtament is there muſt alſo of neceſſity be the death of the teſtator, for a teſtament is of force after men are dead, otherwiſe it is of no ſtrength at all while the teſtator liveth." Heb. ix. 16.

But in ſome other places it muſt be tranſlated *covenant*: covenants were made by blood, and had mediators, not ſo proper to teſtaments.

And both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian religions are in their general nature *laws*, for any diſpoſition of things of authoritative obligation, and eſpecially if it be a conſtitution declaring *rights* and ſettling *dues*, muſt neceſſarily be a *law*. There is propriety in calling them by theſe ſeveral names becauſe of the affinity between a teſtament, covenant, and law, and alſo becauſe both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian religions, partake of the nature of theſe conſtitutions. As to a teſtament it is a maxim among civilians that, *voluntas Teſtatoris, pro lege habetur: the will of the teſtator ſhould be accounted law*. And is law to the legatees, and from hence *legare* to bequeath, and *legacy* are derived.

A mutual covenant is ever allowed to be *law* to the contracting parties, and the terms of it are laws. The public law of a commonwealth is by Demoſthenes called, "A certain agreement or compact of the people." In a law the nature of a covenant is involved, becauſe it implicitly promiſeth indemnity or reward. Laws and public covenants both have a ſanction (a ſanguine) as covenants were made by the blood of ſacrifices, and the penal part of laws, conſecrate the blood of the tranſgreſſor to them. Teſtaments and covenants agree in having an eſtabliſhment by death, and blood; the death of the teſtator, and the death and blood of the ſacrifice at making covenants. But what is moſt noticeable in each is, that they create rights and dues, claims and titles according to law, which accrue to a legatory by a teſtament, to a covenantee by a covenant, and by the conſtitutional law of every polity, the rights and dues of rulers and ſubjects are ſettled, and declared.

1. Of a Teſtament.

A teſtament conſtitutes heirs, and in the ſtrict law ſenſe none is *heir to the living*, or at leaſt can come into poſſeſſion while the teſtator liveth. By *inheritance* the *patrimony* is to be underſtood, or the eſtate of the rights of a perſon deceaſed, with the right of ſucceeding thereunto. But in this ſtrict ſenſe neither Chriſt nor Chriſtians can be heirs of God, or have right to any divine inheritance, becauſe God cannot die. If a teſtament is only the will of the dead, and is of no force while the teſtator liveth, there can be no ſuch teſtament of God, for "the great Jehovah cannot die." In this ſtrict ſenſe neither the old, nor new, are God's teſtaments. But in a holy popular ſenſe, the firſt covenant was a teſtament. "For if one will be a great benefactor to others, and ſo make and publiſh an irrevocable ſettlement of his eſtate, giving the right of heirs, and beſtowing the right of inheritance, thus deviſing his goods, to be received after a certain time, though he die not,

he maketh his will or teſtament." This act and deed is his ſettlement ſo as to be his teſtament. If legacies are not of the eſſence of a teſtament, yet the giving the right of heirs, and beſtowing the right of inheritance, are ſo far eſſential, that ſome civilians, have defined a teſtament to be *inſtitutio hæredis*, the making of an heir. When God made Abraham an heir, by a diſpoſal of his eſtate to him, and his ſeed, and when he made it irrevocable, certain beaſts and birds being ſlain and divided in the midſt, and the pieces laid one againſt another, and a burning lamp paſſed between them, by this ſolemn act and deed, he made and confirmed his Abrahamical teſtament. Gen. xv. To this teſtament, complicated with the Moſaic, the Apoſtle refers when he ſaith, "Neither was the firſt teſtament dedicated without blood." Heb. ix. 18. As in a ſtrict proper teſtament there muſt be the death of the teſtator, ſo this had the nature of a teſtament ſo far, as not to be dedicated without ſomething of death and blood. Teſtaments and covenants ſo far agree in this, even their being made and eſtabliſhed by death and blood. The goſpel teſtament and covenant was confirmed by death and blood, but God the teſtator did not die. A teſtament is a noble deed of ſettlement becauſe it inſtituteth heirs: the chriſtian teſtament is of this nature, "That they which are called might receive the promiſe of eternal inheritance." Both teſtaments agree in another reſpect as being witneſſed to by teſtable perſons. Human teſtaments are firſt *nuncupative*, and are valid even then, if ſufficiently atteſted. Both theſe teſtaments were of this kind for ſome time, but are now regiſtered by divine ſcribes.

Chriſt as firſt born, and the appointed principal heir, is executor of the new teſtament, and diſtributes to *his joint heirs*, the legacies bequeathed: and all their claims to ſpiritual and heavenly bleſſings are by virtue of, and according to the new teſtament, in Chriſt's blood.

2. Diatheke ſometimes ſignifies a covenant, and both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian religions agree in being covenants.

A mere promiſory ſettlement of things is ſometimes in ſcripture called a covenant, but it is only a covenant of one party, is not mutual, but is abſolute without conditions or a mediator. Such was the covenant of day and night, of not drowning the world, made not only with Noah but with every beaſt of the field: and ſuch was the *promiſe* of God to Abraham concerning his ſeed, and to Phineas about the prieſthood. In making theſe God took upon himſelf a binding engagement to others, but no *conſederating act or explicit conſent* on their part was required, they were neither mutual, nor with ſeals. A ſtatute or conſtitution is called a covenant, where a ſettlement of things is made by promiſe: and a *covenant of ſalt*, as ſalt was uſed to make covenants firm. Numb. xviii. 19.

There are but two proper mutual covenants mentioned in the Bible, as ever ſubſiſting between God and mankind, in this world, the old and new, firſt, and ſecond, Abrahamical-Moſaical, and the chriſtian.

Divines indeed have written much concerning a ſuppoſed "covenant of life made with Adam not only for himſelf, but for his poſterity, upon condition of perfect obedience, forbiding him to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil upon pain of death." But when we look into the Bible we find no ſuch covenant in name or nature, nothing that amounts to a poſitive promiſory ſettlement. If the Adamical conſtitution was an inſtitution and covenant of eternal life, there would be one covenant before the firſt, for the Abrahamical as complicated with the Moſaical is certainly the firſt covenant. We read only of a poſitive prohibition with a penalty, and a tacit promiſe that he ſhould not die penally while he did not ſin. Of Adam's federal headſhip we read nothing, but of his natural headſhip we do. I. Cor. xv. 45, 46. That a natural man,

without the ſpirit, for *a natural man, Pſychikos Anthropos hath not the Spirit*, Jude. 19. ſhould be a ſpiritual federal head and repreſentative of his natural deſcendants, is of all abſurdities the moſt abſurd, yet it is reputed orthodox.

But the Abrahamical as complicated with the Moſaical, and the Chriſtian, are proper mutual covenants: being agreements between two perſons or parties, wherein each become engaged to the other for the performance of certain ſpecified articles. God's covenant, as an inſtitution of religion, contains precepts, promiſes, and penalties. The firſt covenant ſettled the benefit part of it upon the Iſraelites, upon their doing the duty part of it, with a penalty annexed in caſe of failure. The benefit is contained in its promiſes, the penalty is contained in its threatenings. The Chriſtian covenant is like to it in theſe reſpects, with a *ſpecific* difference as to its *nature*. The chriſtian preachers like Moſes, tender the covenant to men with its benefits, and manage a treaty with them to bring them into the bonds of it. None were Jews, and none are Chriſtians while wholly out of covenant. In the covenant God taketh upon himſelf a binding engagement to be unto the covenanters *a God*: and he requires them to take on themſelves a binding engagement to be unto Him *a people*. Thus Prince and people confederate. "I ſwore unto thee, and entered into covenant with thee, and thou becameſt mine." Ezek. xvi. 8. "They alſo ſwore unto him and *avouched* the Lord to be their God." Deut. xxvi. 17, 18.

3. The word *Diatheke*, as applied to the Jewiſh and Chriſtian religions, involves in it the general notion of *law*, and theſe are both laws.

*The law came by Moſes.* And although the New Teſtament is diſtinguiſhed from and oppoſed to that, yet it is as truly *law*, *a chriſtian kind of law*: a law which all the world to whom it is promulged are bound to receive and obey. It is a law to

the faith, and practice of all chriſtians. The prophets ſpeak of it as law. "Out of Zion ſhall go forth the law: a law ſhall proceed from me: the Iſles ſhall wait for his law." Iſa. ii. 3. li. 4. xlii. 4. The voice from heaven ſaid, "This is my beloved Son, *hear ye him.*" His leſſons are virtually laws; his inſtructions are his edicts; his teachings are his commands; *verily, verily, I ſay unto you*, expreſſeth his authority, as the prophets expreſſed God's with a *thus ſaith the Lord.* The prophets ſpeak of Chriſt to come as a Lord and lawgiver, with the power and authority of legiſlation. Iſa. xxxiii. 22. The all power given Chriſt in heaven and on earth, includes the power of legiſlation, and giving out commands which all his ſubjects are bound to obey. Religion is matter of law, and obligation, ſuch is the chriſtian religion. Every man's duty is matter of law to him. If chriſtians were not under law to Chriſt, they could not be ſinners, for ſin is a tranſgreſſion of law, as being a violation of duty and obligation. Conſidering Chriſtianity as the kingdom of God, it muſt have a public law, ſettling the polity, declaring the rights and dues of rulers and ſubjects. And that the goſpel law is not the holy moral law properly ſuch, though it adopts that as a rule of life in the matter of it, but a new remediable law, appears evident in that repentance and faith are not of the moral law. And ſuch precepts of the old commandments as the goſpel enjoins, come under a new conſideration, are enacted by a new authority, obeyed by new men, from new motives, with other meaſures, and for another end and purpoſe. The old law requires us to love our neighbor *as ourſelves*; the new to love one another *as Chriſt hath loved us. Repent and believe, believe and be baptized. Obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you*, are evidently new commands.

The titles of Teſtaments, Covenants, and Laws, import them to be honorary and noble ſettlements. By them as

teſtaments men are heirs of God. A covenant of the people, is the *charter* of their liberty, the *inſtrument* of their freedom. Iſa. xlii. 6, 7. and xlix. 8, 9. Chriſtianity is the *law* of liberty as it makes us free: and the charter of our immunities, rights and privileges.

Conſidering theſe teſtaments or covenants as inſtitutions of religion, the *covenant* muſt be laid as the *foundation*. It is ſo on God's part, and muſt be ſo on ours. God is *our God* as being in covenant, and we are *his*.

"The foundation of God ſtandeth ſure," &c. II. Tim. ii. 19. The word rendered foundation ſome tranſlate a *covenant*, or *contract*, whereby two parties mutually oblige themſelves to each other. Seals were affixed to covenants, and ſometimes there was an inſcription on each ſide agreeable to the conditions of the contract. Here is a ſeal to a covenant with this inſcription on God's part, "The Lord knoweth," &c. and on man's part, "Let every one that," &c. There is a relation to a foundation which ſtandeth ſure, and to a contract ſealed, the former is the *verbal*, the latter is the *real* meaning. *Themelios*, ſignifies foundation: but if it be aſked what *that* is to which the notion of foundation belongs, the anſwer is God's *covenant*. Read it thus, The foundation of God, which is his covenant, ſtandeth ſure, having a ſeal to it as a *covenant*, and an inſcription on the ſeal as a *foundation*.

That which is the foundation of God ſtandeth ſure, the covenant of God is that which is his foundation, with a ſeal and inſcription on God's part and man's part. That covenant of God which was Moſaical, was the foundation of all claims to Judaical privileges: and the new covenant is the foundation of all claims to chriſtian privileges, and bleſſings. God doth not adminiſter the affairs of religion *arbitrarioufly*, or by *abſolute ſovereignty*, but agreeably to the tenor of his own covenant. He is immenſely gracious and condeſcending in making this covenant.

admitting men into it, and aſſiſting men to fulfil its terms: but he hath no ſaving mercy to men's ſouls only according to the tenor of the new and everlaſting covenant. "If children, then heirs:" but if not children, then no heirs to an eternal inheritance. Aliens from the commonwealth of Iſrael had no inheritance in the earthly Canaan: and the non allied to God and Chriſt in the covenant of grace, can expect no inheritance in heaven. The contrary ſuppoſition would overturn the foundation of God in both teſtaments. But God's covenant is a foundation ſurely founded, and faith and hope grounded on it are ſure: but all expectations without his covenant will fail. Such as were not *native* Jews, became Jews *active*, and both by the terms of the covenant. We become Chriſtians and heirs of eternal life, by becoming parties in the new covenant. The leading duty in Judaiſm and Chriſtianity is contained in the prophets. Iſa. xliv. 5. We muſt avouch God to be our God, Chriſt to be our Savior, the Holy Ghoſt to be our Renewer and Sanctifier, and then obſerve all things commanded. Become ſubjects in ſtate, and then act as the law of the ſtate requires. And if any, in any nation, are fearers of God and workers of righteouſneſs, they ſhall be accepted of God according to the tenor of that covenant, and through the univerſal redemption of Chriſt, which they have not had any explicit knowledge of, becauſe it hath not been revealed to them.

II. Of the firſt or old teſtament, covenant, or law.

By this we underſtand the Abrahamic covenant of circumciſion, ſeparate from the promiſe, as complicated with the Moſaic or Sinai covenant; which had a worldly ſanctuary, and is a law of works, and of carnal commandments. Heb. ix. 1.

We mean by it no ſuppoſed covenant with Adam, no different edition, or legal diſpenſation of the covenant of grace, of which ſome abſurdly ſpeak. The covenant of grace did

not exiſt until the death of Chriſt, only in prophecy, in promiſe, in type and figure, as there was then no Chriſt only in the divine foreordination, nor until the baptiſm of Jeſus by John, when he was made Chriſt, by the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon him. The goſpel is the new teſtament in Chriſt's blood, which had no eſtabliſhment until his blood was ſhed, though as he was the Lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world in the typical ſacrifices of him, God treated believers in the promiſe, according to the tenor of it. The Abrahamic promiſory conſtitution is to be diſtinguiſhed from the covenant of Abraham, which was the Judaical covenant initially introduced. But the promiſory conſtitution was no mutual covenant: Abraham became an heir not by the law, or firſt covenant, but by promiſe.

Holy men were believers in a Chriſt to come in the times of Judaiſm, and were Chriſtians thereby without the name, and initial Judaiſm was as old as the ſacrifices of Cain and Abel, who were Jews without the name. All ſpiritual bleſſings were derived to them through faith in the abſolute promiſe of God, which was before any covenant of circumciſion was made. It is therefore evident that no ſpiritual bleſſing could be derived by the covenant of circumciſion, which was after the bleſſings were poſſeſſed by promiſe. Believers kept all the laws of God as being in a ſtate of grace by their belief of the promiſe, and they Judaized in their rights and obſervances. They were God's believers, and Chriſt's prophetic believers, and obtained righteouſneſs by faith, as Abraham did, and all chriſtians do, being uncircumciſed. Rom. iv. 10. For want of diſtinguiſhing between the *promiſe* of Abraham, and the *covenant* of Abraham, things that differ have been confounded. The firſt or old teſtament and covenant as completely eſtabliſhed is certainly the Moſaic Sinai covenant: now if the covenant of Abraham was the goſpel covenant, the new and ſecond

covenant muſt be four hundred and thirty years before the firſt or old covenant. Gal. iii. 17. But certainly the Abrahamic covenant complicated with the Moſaic, and as diſtinguiſhed from the *promiſe*, was the firſt old, faulty covenant, that was ready to vaniſh away. Heb. viii. 7. Certainly the firſt covenant, conſidered as either Abrahamical or Moſaical, was made by the blood of beaſts and birds, and contained no promiſe of eternal inheritance, and therefore could not be the new or goſpel covenant under any edition or diſpenſation, but totally diſtinct from it, and of another nature, ratified by the blood of Chriſt. Great ſtreſs is laid upon circumciſion's being the *ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith*. But the faith of which it is the ſeal Abraham had while uncircumciſed, ſo that a carnal ordinance confirmed an antecedent ſpiritual promiſe, and was alſo a *token* of a covenant of future temporal bleſſings to Abraham's natural ſeed.

Therefore the firſt Abrahamic and Moſaic covenant was abſtracted from its types and figures, only a *civil moral*, or *civil religious inſtitution*, but not *ſpiritual religious*, which by way of teſtament, covenant, and law, made a ſettlement of the ſecular, worldly and national concerns, of Abraham and the old or literal Iſrael. This is its proper idea, and ſpecific nature, as a covenant. It enjoined *a this world religion*, having a worldly ſanctuary, and temporal promiſes, for the reward of obedience was life, but death without mercy for its penalty in caſe of diſobedience. It was added to the promiſe becauſe of *tranſgreſſions*, that is the prevalence of tranſgreſſions in men who had not faith, for it was made for the lawleſs, and not the righteous, juſt as the civil moral conſtitution of other ſtates, even where the goſpel is profeſſed, is added to reſtrain the licentiouſneſs and diſobedience of non believers. I. Tim. i. 9. If all men had been believers in the promiſe: and if all lived and obeyed the goſpel, the law would be unneceſſary.

1. The firſt and ſecond covenants differ as law and grace, temporal and earthly promiſes differ from ſpiritual and heavenly, and upon this account the latter is the better : Heb. viii. 6. and they are ſo oppoſite to each other, that to expect any ſpiritual benefit from the former, deſtroys the latter, Gal. ii. 21. v. 4. as their different adminiſtration ſhews. II. Cor. iii. 6, 7, 8, 9. No freedom from the ſervitude of ſin, no regeneration, no juſtification in the ſight of God, no cleanſing as pertaining to the conſcience, accrued to any by the firſt covenant. They might be good Judaical citizens by a civil religious obſervance of that covenant, as Paul and the young man were, but could be no ſpiritual holy men, becauſe they received not the ſpirit by the law, but by the hearing of faith. That all their promiſes were temporal is moſt evident from a variety of ſcriptures. Levit. xxvi. 3. Deut. xxviii. Exod. xxiii. 3. &c.

The land of Canaan was the great inheritance promiſed, and exciſion from it the great penalty threatened : God's being a God to them according to the tenor of that covenant, is to be underſtood in a temporal and national ſenſe. The Jews believed in a life and Meſſiah to come, but did not derive this from the law covenant, but from prior revelations. The righteouſneſs of the law is our *own*, originating from a birth of the will of man, it exalts a nation when prevalent among rulers, and ruled, but can anſwer no ſpiritual purpoſes. Repentance according to the tenor of it only averted temporal judgment, as in Ahab, and the Ninevites, and procured like bleſſings when obeyed, and juſtified from ſomething, but not as to ſpiritual matters. Acts xiii. 39. Even the moral law as a law of that covenant was of civil religious interpretation, as it is now in all civil ſtates where it is adopted, and comes under human cognizance and juriſdiction. Overt acts only are rewardable or puniſhable by it : temporal life and death, are its higheſt reward and puniſhment.

2. The firſt teſtament involved in it a *prophetical* and *typical* inſtitution to chriſtianity.

The epiſtle to the Hebrews fully ſhews how almoſt every thing in Judaiſm, ſhadowed forth ſomething in Chriſtianity. The way of prophecying in old times was not only by words but by types and figures. The type and antitype cannot be of the ſame ſpecific nature: figures and ſhadows of things to come are not the things themſelves, nor yet the ſubſtance. Natural and earthly things may be types of ſpiritual and heavenly things, but theſe latter can be no types of the former. To prevent all miſconceptions concerning the Adamical, Patriarchal, and Judaical economies, let it be particularly obſerved, Firſt, that the Adamical inſtitution was expreſsly no inſtitution to eternal life, but only a temporary diſpenſation for the trial of man, according to whoſe conduct the courſe of nature was to be eſtabliſhed in this world. Secondly, that Adam and the Patriarchs were believers in Chriſt to come, and became entitled to ſpiritual and eternal benefits only thereby.

Thirdly, the law of nature, and the moral law as then revealed and known, was their rule of life, as being in a ſtate of grace by a belief of the promiſe.

Fourthly, they had certain rites, ceremonies, and obſervances of a typical nature, enjoined upon them, to lead them to Chriſt, and which were to laſt until the goſpel covenant was made. Theſe types were various and numerous, hiſtorical, real, and perſonal. The whole hiſtory of the Jews, their bondage in Egypt under Pharaoh, their deliverance, their travels in the wilderneſs, paſſing Jordan, ſettlement in Canaan, &c. were typical of ſpiritual, chriſtian, and heavenly matters. Moſes, Joſhua, the High Prieſt, their judges, deliverers, kings, were perſonal types of Chriſt. The brazen ſerpent, manna, rock, &c. were real types of him. Some types were characteriſtical, and deſcriptive types of him, the moſt noted was the paſchal Lamb. If

that Lamb had been *rational* and *prophetic*, he would have ſpoken thus in the perſon of his character, and ſome part would apply to himſelf, and ſome to Chriſt. "I am a perfect unblemiſhed Lamb, ſet apart on the tenth day of the month Niſan, put to a bloody death on the fourteenth: I am ſacrificed, my fleſh is roaſted, my blood is ſprinkled: I am the Lord's paſſover, they pierce my hands, but not a bone of me is broken, they who ſee me laugh me to ſcorn," &c.

This is true of the Divine Lamb, and was proper to the Paſchal Lamb, applying ſome of it to the typical and ſome to the antitypical Paſchal Lamb who was ſacrificed for us. Their ceremonial types were, ſymbols, patterns, or ſhadows, of heaven and heavenly things. Some were hiſtorically commemorative, as their ſabbaths and feaſts: others ſignificative of moral purity, as incenſe, ſalt, the diſcarding leaven, circumciſion, their ablutions, abſtinences, and ſuch more. Their ſacrifices were either typical of Chriſt's, or of the ſpiritual ſacrifices of chriſtians; and eſpecially did the blood of their covenant, typify the blood of Chriſt in the new teſtament.

3. The firſt teſtament or covenant involved in it, the holy ſpiritual moral law, as a covenant *once* ſubſiſting between God and rationals, with reſpect to their ſpiritual and eternal intereſts.

The firſt covenant literally and primarily reſpected their bodily intereſts *expreſsly*, and their *ſoul* intereſts *covertly*. The moral law never was an effectual inſtitution to eternal life, or any covenant between God and men, in *this world*, for any ſuch purpoſe. But it had been a covenant of life, ordained to continue life to unlapſed rationals, in God's original kingdom, and having been violated by ſome angels, and by all human rationals, it could not give life to tranſgreſſors. Yet it is held forth to men to teach them their condition under and by it, and what they deſerve if the law had its courſe. However true it may be that the doer of the law ſhall be juſtified, and that un-

ſinning obedience renders the reward of debt: it is equally true that it curſeth every one that doth not obey it in all things. And this is the legal condition of all mankind. But God is not imputing to the world their treſpaſſes according to law, and offers them a covenant to lay hold of, which contains a law that can give life. And if they reject this offer they will be condemned to *a ſorer* puniſhment for their unbelief, than death without mercy by the law of Moſes, even the ſecond death.

The law is good if uſed lawfully, to convince of ſin, guilt and condemnation, and of the need of Chriſt to end it for righteouſneſs. But God doth not require obedience to the law as the condition of life, but faith in Chriſt. Rom. x. 9. Dr. Watts ſaith, "That when St. Paul deſigned to repreſent the original covenant, and the conditions of it, *do and live, curſed is every one*, &c. he doth it by quotations out of the old teſtament, becauſe the language of the Jewiſh covenant, is the language alſo of the original covenant, and God governed them much in that way with regard to their temporal rewards and puniſhments." On the other hand he ſaith, "When St. Paul ſpeaks of ſpiritual matters, or of the covenant of grace, as it then exiſted, which was only in prophecy, type and figure, he cites the Jewiſh ſcriptures, becauſe they direct to eternal life by teſtifying of Chriſt." Thus the righteouſneſs of faith was witneſſed to by the law and the prophets. The firſt covenant was faulty, elſe there would have been no room for the ſecond, as being weak through the fleſh.

III. Of the new teſtament, covenant and law.

This is eſſentially and ſpecifically different from the old, not only in its mode of adminiſtration, but in the very *matter* of it. A legal diſpenſation of the covenant of grace, is contrary to the ſcripture notion of law and grace. If the old teſtament was the firſt edition of the new, as ſome ſpeak, it was an edition

of a teſtament not made. Theſe two teſtaments are as diſtinct as oil and water, and will never mix, but will ſeparate themſelves however ſhook together.

The character of *newneſs* which is eſſential to chriſtianity, was a great objection againſt it, at its riſe, and a principal cauſe of its ill reception and treatment in the world. Several Roman Emperors in their edicts againſt it, and its profeſſors, give it as a reaſon, that it was a *new ſuperſtition*, and they had forſaken the *ancient* religion. The pagans brought Paul to Areopagus to know what, the *new doctrine*, whereof he ſpake, was. Acts. xvii. 19. They reproached chriſtianity with being a *new religion*, but of yeſterday compared with their *ancient* religions. People in general have a great and often an extravagant veneration for *antiquity*, they glory in it, and are governed by it. Bellarmine brings this as one proof, that the Romiſh is the true church: but in this they muſt yield to the pagans, the Pantheon is older than Peter's, and the gods of the nations are as fit objects of worſhip, as their all *ſaints* are.

When Luther began the reformation, a great clamor was raiſed againſt the *newneſs* of his doctrine, and the fewneſs of its abettors. In ſome caſes the ſcriptures ſpeak favorably of antiquity: ancient and honourable are joined together: nations have contended for it, cuſtoms acquire authority by it, and obtain the force of laws. What hath ſtood the ſhock of ages, ſeems to be allied to the *ancient of days*. But in ſome reſpects oldneſs is a diſparagement. Old teſtament, old man, old ſerpent, old things, oldneſs of the letter, old wives fables, &c. are ſpoken againſt. The new creation, new teſtament, new man, new wine, new ſong, &c. are repreſented as moſt excellent. Man's attachment to old creeds, catechiſms, and confeſſions, and averſion to what is new have tended to ſuppreſs the habit of thinking, and the following precedents in divinity, hath lengthened, and ſtrengthened the chain of error.

The heathen were ſo tenacious of their ancient rites, that it was death by the Grecian and Roman laws to introduce a new religion, or to deny that which they had received by tradition from their fathers. And even in this enlightened age, the denial of old errors, and advancing new ſcripture truths expoſes him that dares it, to be hard thought, and evil ſpoken of, and it is regretted they can proceed no farther. Chriſtians who are men of the new teſtament, covenant, and law, ought not to be afraid of new truths deduced from ſcripture by an impartial ſearch after truth with unfettered minds. But to gratify ſuch as are fond of antiquity.

1 Chriſtianity ſhall be proved to be the *oldeſt* ſaving religion this world ever ſaw, that it is as old as the creation in a better ſenſe than Tinal's book, with this title aſſerts, nay older than the world itſelf. The Athenians called the thirtieth day of their month, when the moon was both old and new, *old* and *new*. Now although the chriſtian religion was not formed into a teſtament covenant and law, until the blood of Chriſt was ſhed: Yet it was of *primary deſign* with God in the creation of this world, and in the *foreordination* of Chriſt, and our election in him, it was even before the foundation of the world. I. Pet. i. 20. Eph. i. 4. Titus i. 2. II. Tim. i. 9. What is foreordained or promiſed to come, may be certain, but its exiſtence is only in the mind of the foreordainer or promiſor, or of thoſe who believe therein. And when what was foreordained or promiſed hath come, that thing or perſon may be ſaid to be before all things and perſons which came into being *after* ſuch foreordination or promiſe, or in order to their accompliſhment. What is foreordained hath not, but muſt come to paſs in its time: and what is foreordained conſequentially, and ſubordinately to the firſt foreordination, and in order to its fulfilment, even though it exiſt prior in the order of time to the actual being of what was firſt foreordained, yet is after it in

the divine conſtitution and ſucceſſion of things. And in this ſenſe *Chriſt is before all things*. Coloſ. i. 17. He had no *perſonal* exiſtence as Jeſus the Son of God until his generation and nativity at Bethlehem, nor *official* being as Chriſt until his unction with the Holy Ghoſt at his baptiſm by John, for then Jeſus was made Chriſt, and not Chriſt made Jeſus. He could not therefore be before all things in actual being as to time, as Jeſus or Chriſt, unleſs the all things are to be underſtood of the new created all things by him. Its being in the preſent tenſe, and predicated of Jeſus after he was made Chriſt as officers are made, ſhews that he is the firſt and before all things, in the divine deſign, ſucceſſion and order of things. Chriſt and his religion was firſt in the divine predeſtination, and is firſt in the ſucceſſion and order of things. *They* are for him and not he for *them*. If Chriſt had not been choſen firſt, we could not have been choſen in him. And after the creation of this ſyſtem and of man, there hath been no other way to obtain eternal life but as the gift of God through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, as to come, or as come. Abſtinence from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, prevented a penal ſubjection to natural death, but the tree of life a type of Chriſt was to give him life. Adam might be let farther into the plan of redemption than we have any account of. In the inſtitution of ſacrifices he might be told their reference to Chriſt. And they be conſidered, by ſuch as offered them in faith as Abel did, but which they could not do without a divine inſtitution, as prefigurations of the Lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world. The predictive curſe pronounced upon the ſerpent, "That the ſeed of the woman ſhould bruiſe his head," might be in man's hearing; and be his ſupport while hearing his own ſentence, according to the true import of the original threatening. Thou ſhalt die, i. e. naturally and penally, for duſt thou art and unto duſt ſhalt thou return. That the

curſe ſhould be the firſt bleſſing through Chriſt is a miſtake of ſome.

This world never would have been made, nor man created of the earth earthy, nor natural and corruptible as fleſh and blood are, and were, if God had not purpoſed their ſalvation by Chriſt. Eph. iii. 11. The offspring and children of God the Father of Spirits, are here made partakers of fleſh and blood, and rank with beaſts, being ſubject to this vanity, not willingly, but by him, (God) who ſubjected them in hope of deliverance, from the bondage of corruption, with full redemption and ſalvation by Chriſt. Heb. ii 14. Eccl. iii. 18, &c. Rom. viii. 20.

The antiquity of Chriſt and his religion is implied in theſe words of Chriſt to the Jews. "Your father Abraham, rejoiced to ſee my day he ſaw it, and was glad. Then ſaid the Jews, thou art not yet fifty years old, and haſt thou ſeen Abraham? Jeſus ſaid unto them, verily, verily, I ſay unto you, before Abraham was, I am." John viii. 56, 57, 58. Theſe words have been ſtrangely miſunderſtood by great and good men, as well as by theſe captious Jews. They have tried to prove from them the prior exiſtence of Chriſt to Abraham, the very thing which is denied: nay that the expreſſion *I am*, imports him to be the *I am* that *I am* which ſpake to Moſes. Exod. iii. 13, 14. And Mr. Henry that he might be right hath two contradictory interpretations. Before Abraham was I am Jehovah. Before Abraham was I am the Mediator. The text in Exodus is totally foreign to this. There it ſignifies "I will be what I was, I will be in fact what I was in promiſe." I will be the true God conſtant to my promiſe made to your Fathers as it is explained, v. 15, "Thus ſhalt thou ſay unto the children of Iſrael, Jehovah the God of your fathers hath ſent me unto you, this is my name for ever, and my memorial unto all generations." Again, "I appeared unto Abraham by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them."

Exod. vii. 3. They knew his name to be Jehovah, but they did not know him by the *reality* of what that name ſignifies, *a fulfiller of his promiſes*. The name Jehovah denotes the *verity* of his being as oppoſed to falſe gods, and the certainty of his fulfilling what he had promiſed. Here was propriety in the aſſumption of this name, and ſending Moſes under it, to declare his meſſage.

But the words of Chriſt have no relation to any name or promiſe, but only predicate ſome thing of himſelf. Dr. Sherlock ſaith, "The words are a mere ſoleciſm, and according to analogy of language expreſs nothing: no idea belongs to them: for a man cannot in his mind carry the preſent time back and make it antecedent to the time already paſt; and therefore to ſay, before ſuch a thing was, I am, is ſhuffling ideas together, which can have no place in the mind or underſtanding." And after all he will have this no meaning expreſſion, I am, to ſignify eternity and permanency of duration.

Chriſt had ſaid ſeveral things to theſe captious Jews, which appeared to them as riddles or untruths, by uſing words in one ſenſe and they underſtanding them in another. "If a man keep my ſaying he ſhall never ſee death." For this they tell him he had a devil. So here, by "Before Abraham was I am," they underſtood him as ſaying he was before Abraham in time, that he had ſeen Abraham, and Abraham had ſeen him, but he ſaith nothing like this, or any thing that implies it, but rather the reverſe. Abraham deſired to ſee his *day*, he ſaw it, but it was future to Abraham: It is the goſpel day, the time of his coming in fleſh, as the ſeed in whom all nations were to be bleſſed. Abraham ſaw this day as to come, by faith, but he could not have ſeen it, if that day had not been before Abraham in the divine deſign, promiſe and ſucceſſion of things. To take in the ſenſe we muſt read it thus. "Before Abraham was born or made in his day, I am the Chriſt in my day. Our

tranſlators have left this text without their uſual addition. I am ; What ? In other places they ſupply the word *Chriſt* or *he*, John iv. 26. viii. 24, 28. xiii. 19. and if they had done it here, much learned labour to obſcure a plain aſſertion might have been prevented. One of Mr. Henry's interpretations is true, but the other cannot be true where he applys it to the Jehovah of Moſes. " Before Abraham was, I am the Mediator, he was appointed the Meſſiah long before Abraham, the Lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world." The learned Grotious ſaith, " Chriſt was before Abraham by divine conſtitutions and appointment." This needs the following addition. " In the order and ſucceſſion of things, in the divine conſtitution, before Abraham was in his day, I am the Chriſt in my day." Chriſt as actually exiſting in his day, had an antientry to all old teſtament ſaints. If Chriſt had not been foreordained to come, and conſidered as come in his day, by that God who calleth things that are not, as though they were, there would have been no this world, no Adam, no Abraham or their economies of religion. The real exiſtence of Chriſt in his day as Mediator and Maker of the new teſtament, is the antecedent and procuring cauſe of all the ſaving benefits, which Abraham and the ancient ſaints enjoyed, and what he was to be, and do in his day, is the only conſideration for which they were granted. Suppoſing that in the divine mind which views all *futurities* as realities, it had been determined, that A B and C ſhould never have been brought into being in this world, nor, being criminals, enjoyed liberty and life, in the *days of Moſes*, but in conſideration of what *David was to be and do in his day* : and this had been revealed to theſe criminals, and their belief of it was the condition of their liberation : David might ſay, Before theſe men were in their day, I am in my day ; becauſe if it had not been for me, they would not have been : I, though *after them in time*, am before them in the ſucceſſion of

things, and the cauſe of their being, and being what they are in their day.

Thus we are to underſtand what John ſaith, "He that cometh after me, is preferred before me, for he was before me." John iii. 16. He was before me, not *in time*, for this would contradict what he had ſaid of his coming after him, but *in dignity* : *Protos cenmoi*, he was firſt to me, or my chief in dignity, as he is preferred before me in eſteem. Chriſt was after John in time, but before him in eſtimation, and dignity, as the Prince is before the harbinger that prepares his way.

Chriſt and the new teſtament therefore in the divine conſtitution of things and perſons, are before this world and all things in it. If God had not predeſtinated him and his religion, before the world, there would have been no this world, Moſaic creation, Adam, Abraham, no firſt covenant, nor John the Baptiſt to prepare his way. And in this way we are to underſtand our Savior. "Glorify me with thine own ſelf, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. And thou lovedſt me before the foundation of the world." This was only in divine foreordination and decree, and in view of his doing his mediatorial work. It is mediatorial and not eſſential glory he prays for, it is this he now enjoys, and gives ſome of it to his diſciples, as the Father gave it to him, but as to eſſential glory, if he had poſſeſſed any before the world was, as he did not, he doth not poſſeſs it now, and would not while the mediatorial laſted, and ſo his prayer is not anſwered, nor like to be, until he delivers up the mediatorial, which is the leſs honorable, and returns to the eſſential glory : So that according to the common interpretation, the exaltation of Chriſt is a real degradation to him. Thus ſcholaſtics by their reputed orthodoxy treat their Savior.

2. Yet the goſpel teſtament covenant and law, as to *actual creation and eſtabliſhment is new*,

Its preexiſtence was in purpoſe, prophecy, promiſe type, figure, and in the treatment of believers according to it. It was *real* in *futurity* before God, and in the benefits rebounding to believers by it. But as Jeſus Chriſt had no perſonal actual being, or manifeſtation until the laſt times of the Jewiſh ſtate: and we read of no prior acts of the preexiſtent ſoul of Chriſt, and if we did, ſuch acts would not be the acts of the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, a perſon afterwards conſtituted, and who when conſtituted, was of yeſterday as to actual being, though he is, and ever will be the ſame, to day and forever. Neither was there any new teſtament made but by means of his death and blood ſhed. Chriſtianity diſtinguiſheth things into old and new: and the old things are firſt in time, had an actual eſtabliſhment prior to the new: and the exiſtence of the new in the times of the being of the old was in fieri, and futuro: but to carry back the actual exiſtence and eſtabliſhment of Jeſus Chriſt and his covenant to be the firſt in time, makes confuſion worſe confounded than a little.

Good Dr. Watt's with much learning and labour in his diſſertation on the glory of Chriſt, hath ſo confuſed his perſon that no conſiſtent idea can be formed of him. Sometimes he acts as a mere human ſoul, ſometimes as a divine angel, and at other times, as a human angel: and anon he acts as an underived divine nature, and again as a diſtinct human nature, or elſe the human nature and divine nature are united, and agency aſcribed to the two united properties. If this is not confuſion confounded, what is? What idea can be affixed to exaltation of the human nature? Is it changed into the divine nature? Or doth the communion or communication of properties the ſchool men ſpeak ſo much of, run one into another, and twiſt two non agents into one? And from this indiſtinctneſs and indeterminateneſs concerning the perſon of Chriſt, hath ariſen a confuſion about the new teſtament, confounding it with the

covenant made with Abraham by the blood of beaſts and birds when it is really the new teſtament in Chriſt's blood, and could not be made until his blood was ſhed. Chriſtianity's being the new teſtament is not diſhonorary to it.—For,

1. It imports it to be a ſettlement *newly* made, and publiſhed. For as the appearance of Chriſt was not until the laſt days of the world preceding the world to come, made by him and put in ſubjection to him: So the new teſtament was made to put an end to the firſt. The old, though ready to periſh and vaniſh away, continued until Chriſt blotted out the hand writing of ordinances that was againſt us, and contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his croſs. Coloſ. ii. 14. The ending of the ſeveral preceding economies by the death of Chriſt, is the diſpenſation of the fulneſs of times, when a new æra commenced, and a new ſettlement was made. Chriſt was the Alpha, the firſt, in the divine conſtitution of things, and he is the Omega, the laſt in the divine eſtabliſhment. His covenant is not only new, but everlaſting alſo, becauſe it will not give way to any other. It is true that in condeſcention to Jewiſh prejudices, the old ſettlement was ſuffered to continue until Jeruſalem and the temple were deſtroyed, and believers in Chriſt were tolerated in the uſe of ſome parts of it, not ſubverſive of the goſpel. Through fondneſs to their old ſchool maſter to Chriſt, they continued under it when they might have been totally free. But when Jeruſalem and the temple were no more, old things paſſed away, and all things became new by actual eſtabliſhment.

2. The epithet of *new* denotes chriſtianity to be a ſettlement of a *new* and different kind, nature, and quality from the old. The very nature and eſſence of it is *new*, as well as the form and adminiſtration: the difference is ſpecifical in all things. St. Auguſtine ſaith, "Moſes delivered a law in Mount Sinai, which is called the old teſtament, becauſe it had earthly promi-

es, and by Jeſus Chriſt a new teſtament is come in which the kingdom of heaven is promiſed. This therefore is the better eſtament: Heb xiii. 6. better in its whole kind.

3. It is a ſettlement of entire *new* matters.

Public civil ſettlements are converſant about *civil* ſociety, dominion and ſovereignty, ſubjection and loyalty, the ſecurity of life, liberty and property, and about civil religious piety and virtue, in order to national exaltation.

But the things of this ſettlement are new matters of divine ſovereignty and ſubjection, ſpiritual religious piety and virtue, of a new kind of life, warfare, learning, freedom, nobility, citizenſhip, heirſhip and inheritance. "May we hear, what this doctrine is whereof thou ſpeakeſt? For thou bringeſt certain ſtrange things to our ears, we would know therefore what theſe things *mean*?" Acts, xvii. 19, 20. All the matters of chriſtianity are new, and ſtrange to the non initiated. Even the old commands which were from the beginning are *new*, as enacted by a new authority, given to new ſubjects, and as to be obeyed from new principles, in a new manner, and with new meaſures of duty. The well inſtructed ſcribe will bring out of his treaſure theſe *old* and *new* things.

4. Chriſtianity may be called *new* upon account of its uncommon excellency and goodneſs.

In good authors newneſs is attributed to things *great* and *good*, of an *excellent quality*, and *worthy of admiration*. Thus the Athenians and ſtrangers ſpent their time in nothing elſe, but either to tell or hear ſome *new*, that is, ſome great, wonderful, and unuſually good, *thing*. Act. xvii. 21. This may be true of the life when we read of *new* heavens, new earth, new man, new creature, new name and new ſong: that is the beſt. The new moral law which is the wine of the kingdom is called *new* to denote its ſuperlative nature and excellency. The *new* is the *great good*, and *beſt teſtament*.

5. Its name *new* imports its perpetual *newneſs* in oppoſition to its *waxing old*, or being ſucceeded by another.

Upon the account of its duration, it is called everlaſting as well as new. For though it is of long ſtanding ſince the death of Chriſt, and it will be long yet to its end, and it is older ſtill in the divine predeſtination, and will be eternal in its effects. Yet while it laſts it will be always new, never antiquated, worn out, or ſucceeded by another: and will remain both the *new and everlaſting covenant*.

From the premiſes it may be inferred that to be a chriſtian is to be an heir of the new teſtament, a new covenanter, and a ſubject of the new kingdom of God. As the Jews were the people of their holy covenant ſo are chriſtians of theirs. Dan. xi. 28, 30. The church is eſpouſed and joined to the Lord by a marriage covenant, and is the Lamb's wife. If Chriſt was only a publiſher of new doctrines it might ſuffice to believe his ſayings: or if he was only an expiator of ſin, it might be enough to rely upon his propitiation. But ſince he is Lord and King in his ſtate of reigning, we muſt enter his kingdom, and become his liege ſubjects by covenant. In human kingdoms native aliens, are initiated and naturalized by conſenting to the laws, and often complicated with ſome rite and an implicit or explicit oath to the ſovereignty, and even by ſigning articles of allegiance. Iſai. xliv. 5. The chriſtian covenant is of affinity to the Roman ſoldiers military oath, who ſwore to follow their leader, as we ſwear to follow the Lamb at all adventures, and not to forſake him. II. Cor. xiii. 5. Pſ. lxxxvii. 5, 6. Matt. x. 37. iv. It is a great thing to be a chriſtian, it is to be a Chriſt, an anointed one.

The differences between theſe teſtaments, covenants, and law, are many and great, as appears evident from what hath been written.

1. They differ in their authors, and manner of formation.

For though they are both God's covenants, and the ſame natural perſon is the author of both, yet it is not the ſame political perſon, or under the ſame relation and character. When he engages to be a God to any according to the tenor of the firſt covenant it muſt be underſtood in a civil religious ſenſe, and in worldly reſpects, and not in that ſpiritual religious ſenſe which the ſame words import under the new covenant; for it is certain their ſpiritual relation came not by the firſt covenant which had a worldly ſanctuary, but by the abſolute promiſe of God to Abraham. God as King of nations was King and God of Iſrael in a peculiar ſenſe: But as King and God of ſaints he promiſed Chriſt, and made the new teſtament in his blood. The death and blood by which they were made was different: as to the firſt it was made only by the blood of beaſts and birds: but as to the ſecond the death and blood was of God, in the perſon of the Son, manifeſt in fleſh.

2. They differ in their religioniſts.

All under the firſt covenant merely ſuch and abſtracted from the promiſes were in the ſtate of the old man, under the law, and not having the ſpirit: and their beſt obedience was like Paul's before his converſion, originating from a birth of the will of man, as unrenewed; or like Amaziah's right in the ſight of the Lord, but not with a perfect, that is renewed heart. They were Jews outwardly, but the religioniſts of the new covenant, are ſpiritual Jews, under grace, dead to the law, new born, believers, and free. With the change of the prieſthood, there is a change of the law, and of all who belong to the chriſtian conſus and ſtate of things. Gal. ii. 20. Heb. viii. 12. Gal. iii. 19.

3. They differ as law and grace.

The firſt is mere law, having an unpleaſing harſhneſs and rigour in the manner of its promulgation and treatment of thoſe under it. But the ſecond though a law, is a law of grace

in the whole of it, and tranſcendent grace and kindneſs appears in all parts of it.

The holy writers exhauſt the powers of language in magnifying the grace of God in the goſpel, calling it the *glory*, the *riches*, the *exceeding riches* of his grace, to a pleonaſm, to the abundance, and ſuperabundance of grace. Rom. v. 20. It bindeth no heavy burdens grievous to be borne. It is a law of kindneſs, not a pandect of rigorous impoſitions: it breaketh not the bruiſed reed, nor quencheth the ſmoking flax, but brings glad tidings of great joy to all people: riches to the poor in ſpirit, eaſe and refreſhment to the weary and heavy laden, the balm of gilead to the broken hearted, drink to the thirſty, the bread of life to the hungry, liberation to priſoners and captives, juſtification to the ungodly by law, and life to the dead. It is a magazine of conſolation to the penſive and afflicted, its language and terms are of ſovereign grace.

4 They differ as the law of works and the law of faith; as our own righteouſneſs, and the righteouſneſs of God by faith; as the deeds of the law and good works, letter and ſpirit; condemnation and juſtification, death and life; unregeneracy and regeneracy: as bondage and ſervitude differ from freedom. II. Cor. iii. 7, 8, 9. Heb. viii. 8, 10, 11. Gal. ix. 22. Col. iii. 9, 10. ſee in the margin. They differ in excellency and perfection and duration; as type and antitype; ſhadow and ſubſtance: And in many other particulars too many to be enumerated.

*Laſtly*, They differ in their Mediator, Moſes and Chriſt, the firſt a ſervant, the ſecond a Son, &c.

5 Of the mediation of Chriſt under the new teſtament or covenant. Heb. ix. 15.

The goſpel hath been conſidered as the mediatorial creation, and kingdom of God, as diſtinguiſhed from the original conſtitution of things, in which no mediator was needed. In the

Moſaic economy, and before God held intercourſe with men through the interpoſition of angels, and eſpecially of one ſingular and eminent Angel called the Angel *of God's preſence*; Iſa. lxiii. 9. for the meaning of this ſee Eſther i. 9. In him God's name was. Exod. xxiii. 23. This Angel always accompanied the divine preſence and as God's *name* or *authority* was in him, ſo by him God may be ſuppoſed to have ſpoken to Moſes. And Moſes mediated between God by him, and the people of Iſrael. Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God is no where called an angel without diſtinction, but the angel or meſſenger of the covenant, by way of prophecy, Matt. iii. 1. as to come. As his covenant was not made until his blood was ſhed, he could be no angel or meſſenger of the covenant until then, only in foreordination and prophecy. As there is but one God, ſo there is but one mediator between God and men in ſpiritual reſpects, even Chriſt Jeſus. The mediation of Moſes was in temporal, and national matters.

1. The office of a mediator is not of one, but God is one. Gal. iii. 20.

There is no room for a mediator where there is but one party: God is one party only in giving the promiſe to Abraham, and therefore there was no mediator of the new teſtament or covenant, while that exiſted only in promiſe. The law covenant ordained by angels had Moſes for its mediator, who ſtood between the Lord and the people to ſhew them the word of the Lord. Deut. v. 5. Where parties are a greeband upon an equality, there is no need of a mediatorial interagent. There was none between God and holy rationals: nor between the Father and the Son in the covenant of redemption. But in giving the law there was God by the angel of his preſence on one part, and the people on the other, and Moſes mediated between them. Even Dr. Whitby allows that Chriſt was not the giver of the law, as the ſuppoſition entirely deſtroys the

apoſtles argument. Heb. ii. 1, 2. 3. It alſo by implication is contrary to Heb. i. 1. But then the Dr. doth not ſuppoſe any angel then perſonated God, or any creature, ſaid, "I am the Lord thy God," &c. but that the divine majeſty there preſent with his thouſands of angels, made ſome of them his miniſter to form the voice by which he ſaid, "I am Jehovah," &c. It is not ſaid the angel ſpake. Acts. vii. 30. 32, 38. But if he did, ſince God's name or authority was in him, his character was very different from that of common ambaſſadors of Kings. Nor is there any incongruity for a dignified angel eſpecially commiſſioned to make the declaration, I am Jehovah, that is in the perſon of my character, for his name is in me, and I belong to his preſence. We want not inſtances of Roman ambaſſadors ſpeaking in their own perſons, "I give you peace, or give you war," when in the name of the ſenate and people of Rome is underſtood. Beſides, here God tells them that he would ſend his Angel to go before them, and that as his name was in him, the pardon or puniſhment he ſhould grant or inflict ſhould be certain. He was properly Jehovah's *proxy*, or *ſubſtitute*, and if any bowed towards him, it was directed to his principal. As a mediator ſuppoſes two parties, and ſome diſagreement, ſo he acts as a middle perſon to bring them together, and if poſſible, ſhould be a *peer* to both.

2. Chriſt was fit to be a mediator between God and men by the conſtitution of his perſon of two natures eſſentially, the human and divine, and by his after aſſumption of the animal nature of man, in fleſh.

As man in his preſent ſtate is in the middle between two worlds of creatures, angelical and animal, and in his ſpirit allied to the former, and in fleſh and blood allied to the latter; and to both in his conjunct perſon, not by any diſtinct ſubſiſtence or agency of one nature ſeparate from the other: So Jeſus was born human divine, the *branch* of Jehovah, and the righteous

*branch* of David: Isai. iv. 2. Jerem. xxiii. 5. And when he came to act as Christ to make him like to his brethren, the children partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same. Heb. ii. 14. Eccl. iii. 18, 19, 20. Then he was in his incarnate humiliation states, the *man God's fellow*, and the *man* whose name is the branch, and assumed the humble title of the Son of man. While he was in flesh he had three natures in one person, the *human* in a true body, the *divine*, in sanctity, and the *animal* in flesh and blood; in neither nature had he any distinct subsistence or separate agency, but was one only intelligent agent. Thus the persons of the regenerate are now constituted. Jesus Christ at his death put off the animal nature, the flesh and blood he had assumed for a little while, and his body by a change of qualities became spiritual and glorious at his resurrection, as the bodies of the saints will be changed like unto his. He was therefore exactly a middle person between God and men, according to the present estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them. A middle person between God the Father and men, and not between the Trinity and men: for it is as such a middle person, human divine, that he is the second person in the trinity. It is noticable that as mediator he is called the *man Christ Jesus*, and he is to be honoured as the Father is and hath all judgment committed to him *because he is, or was the Son of man*: He is the *man* ordained to judge the world. Now in his transactions with God, he is called God, or the Son of God: but when he acts in God's behalf with men, he is called man, or the Son of man. So that in his treating with God he assumes a name expressive of his divinity: But in his treating with men, he assumes the more familiar name of man, or the Son of man. The ground hereof was not his birth of a woman a virgin, as we have before shewn, for man had no concurrence therein, but his becoming the second Adam, when he came from heaven

in his incarnate ſtate: That ground hath now ceaſed ſince his exaltation, and if he is now called man or the Son of man it, is not for what *he is, but hath been, and is now more properly like to the Son of man.* Rev. i. 14.

3. Chriſt is a mediator in reſpect of his poſition or ſtanding. "The head (imperial) of every man (chriſtian) is Chriſt, and the head of the woman, is the man, and the head of Chriſt is God." "Ye are Chriſt's, and Chriſt is God." I. Cor. xi. 3. and 23. A Father muſt be the owner of his Son. He is God's expreſs image and repreſentative, ſuſtaining his perſon, veſted with, and exerciſing his authority. His place now is of God over all, the Father alone excepted. The authority he hath over creatures is divine, and yet not ſelf originate, but given power, like to Joſeph's in Egypt. The Father is the Fountain of life, power, and divinity to him: and he is the mediate ſource of all to us: Of his fullneſs we receive. All that the Father hath are his, given into his hands; and whatſoever things the Father doth, that doth the Son likewiſe. His ſtanding is like that of the angel with one foot in heaven, and the other on earth. With his hand he receives from God, and gives to us, and our returns are in like manner to him, and through him to God. He ſtands as a Days man between God and us, and is the medium of communication, and the channel of conveyance. Angels, or the Angel of God's preſence, or Moſes ſupplied this place, before Chriſt come, but one coming after them is mightier than they, and hath concentred all in himſelf, and we are complete in him who is the head of all principalities, and powers.

4. In all his offices, whole buſineſs, function, and agency, he is a mediator.

As a prophet he *received his doctrine* from God's mouth, ſpake as the Father taught him, and he had learned, and as he commanded, and imparts it unto us. Hear his teſtimony,

"He that ſent me is true, and I ſpeak to the world the things which I have heard of him." John viii. 26. and iii. 31. The revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which he ſent and ſignified it by his angel unto his ſervant John, was what God *gave* unto him to *ſhew* unto his ſervants. Rev. i. 1, 2.

This rationally accounts for his not knowing the day and hour of the judgment, in the days of his fleſh: that it was not then revealed to him as it may be at preſent. When the Father gave to the Son to have life in himſelf, he did not give him his own infinite underſtanding, for then he could not have *increaſed in wiſdom*. To ſay he knew it as God, but not as man, or he knew it in his divine nature, but not in his human nature, is to put a jeſuitical prevarication into his mouth, and is an abſurdity alſo, for neither nature is an intellect, intelligent agent, nor a Son: and Jeſus Chriſt hath not two intellects. We know of no difference between one ſpirit, and another, ſimply or phyſically conſidered, only in degree. They all iſſued from the Father of Spirits in a way to us unknown, and partake of his phyſical eſſence, as ſpirits. We now diſtinguiſh theſe ſpirits into angelical and human, becauſe of the natures in which they dwell, or of the modes of their exiſtence: But thoſe of the human claſs may have been, and may be again equal to the angels: and the ſpirit or ſoul of Chriſt may be infinitely ſuperior to any other derived ſpirit, and yet by the [illegible] of its exiſtence here, increaſe in wiſdom and knowledge [illegible] and receive its intelligence in all matters relating to [illegible] revelation from the Father. Thus the Son is or was [illegible] of the Father, of his boſom counſel, and declared [illegible].

[illegible] office is mediatorial.

[illegible] ſpirit offerings to God for the people, and in virtue [illegible] intercede with God in their behalf. The act of [illegible] a beſeeching God to accept of the oblation as a

ranſom for the offerer. Chriſt offered himſelf a pure ſacrifice, and hath ſtated himſelf in the preſence of God to patronize our cauſe, by making interceſion for the tranſgreſſors, and to bleſs in God's name. "Through him by the ſame ſpirit we have acceſs to the Father."

He is alſo a mediatorial Savior-King.

Though his authority is divine and ſupreme over all, the Father alone accepted: Yet the Father gave him his all power and authority in heaven and on earth, and exalted his whole perſon, not the human nature only, to the throne to adminiſter the affairs of his kingdom in the mediatorial, not original way. All things are of God, as the fountain, by Jeſus Chriſt the one Lord, as the mediate cauſe. We are ſaved by God our Savior through Jeſus Chriſt our Savior. Titus iii. 4, 5, 6. God hath placed him over his houſe, and according unto his word are all his people ruled in the ſupreme way of regency, only in the throne the Father is greater than he. Gen. xli. 40. John xiv. 28.

5. His mediation conſiſts in acting for both parties, treating with God in the behalf of men, and with men in behalf of God.

Moſes acted for both God and men under the firſt covenant: ſometimes his object was God, and ſometimes men. But Chriſt acts in a higher ſphere than Moſes in procuring and executing the covenant: it was made through his blood, and its bleſſings are conferred for his *name's ſake*: and we are accepted in him the beloved. He executes it alſo, for he is the *ſurety* of the *new*, not the old teſtament: engaging his grace to enable us to fulfil the terms of it, by walking not after the fleſh, but after the ſpirit. Rom. viii. 4.

6. Eſpecially doth he mediate in making peace.

The moral univerſe was in a divided poſture, when the Father ſet him forth as a propitiation, and reconciler, to make

peace by the blood of his croſs. His mediation of peace is a work of great importance. God in this world hath ever treated man as one *needing* to be at peace with him: but he never made man at firſt in ſuch a ſtate of variance, enmity, or alienation. Adam came into being in paradiſe in a ſtate of deficiency and imperfection as to ſpirituals, though complete as to naturals. His maker was kind to him, and uſed means to *reſtore* him to ſomething he now wanted, and was once poſſeſſed of. The tree of life a type of Chriſt, ſerved to ſhew him what he wanted, and where it was to be found: and his local ſubordination to the ſpiritual wickedneſſes in ærial heavenly places, even though in a paradiſe was a ſolemn leſſon to him of his preſent degraded and deranged ſtation from his firſt eſtate, and own habitation. In this ſituation of things Chriſt is foreordained, and prophecied of. We read much of the peace that was to be in the Meſſiah's day. And in the goſpel we find him to be our peace, having made peace, and, reconciled all things in heaven and earth, jurally, and is actually reconciling men to God, angels and men, jews and gentiles to each other, to make all one, which will terminate his mediation.

7. Chriſt is a mediator as the way to the Father: John xiv. 6. Eph. ii. 18. Heb. x. 19. and as the mediate cauſe of all things in the chriſtian creation and kingdom of God.

It is juſtly ſuppoſeable, that no creature was capable of this office, and that God would not commit the mighty concerns of his vaſt empire, and the unrivalled honor and glory of his own Majeſty to the management of the moſt exalted creature: nor doth it appear ſafe for men to truſt in one not divine, or leſs than God's *fellow*,

## CHAP. XIII.

### CHRISTIANITY A NEW CREATION OF GOD BY CHRIST.

*Chriſtianity conſidered as the new creation of God by Chriſt: and wherein it conſiſts.*

AS the Goſpel is the kingdom of God and Chriſt, and its conſtitution is the new teſtament, covenant and law, it muſt itſelf therefore be the *new creation of God by Jeſus Chriſt.* And that this is the only creation Jeſus Chriſt the one Lord, is the Author of, hath been before proved, Chap. viii.

*The creation* itſelf is now to be deſcribed.

By a ſtrange and never too much to be lamented fatality, this idea of chriſtianity hath been wholly overlooked, or ſo conceived of, as to be nothing real, much leſs to be ſo important as it ought to be. Scholaſtic divines, ſpoilt through philoſophy, have conſidered it as a mere figurative or metaphorical matter for men to become new creatures in Chriſt: and therefore when there can be no new creatures without a new creation, *that* hath been conſidered as figurative alſo. They might have underſtood the Moſaic creation in the ſame ſenſe, and figuratived it away, as they have done *this* which is as real, and literal, as that was, and much more noble and excellent. The principal cauſe why this new creation hath been ſo little noticed, is the affixing a wrong idea to *creation* itſelf. It hath been generally conceived of, as the production of ſomething out of nothing: or the giving total being to that which had no entity before. There is no word in ſcripture ever uſed, that by its notation or application ſignifies any ſuch thing, nor is there any word in any known language that imports thus much. How what had no manner of being before, is brought into

exiſtance is to us unknown, and inconceivable. And yet the belief of it is reaſonable, ſince nothing can be conceived of as neceſſarily exiſtent, but God, and ſome things do exiſt which are not God. *Create* is a word promiſcuouſly uſed in ſcripture with other words which only ſignify the change of the ſtate and nature of things and beings, by external efficiency. It is often expreſſed by building, "He that built all things is God." It was predicted of the man whoſe name is the branch that he ſhould build the temple of the Lord. Now as to a builder in any ſenſe, every one knows that he doth not create his materials out of nothing, but takes them rough fits and frames them into a compact uniform edifice. And in political matters creation only ſignifies the change of the ſtate of things and beings.

An example may be produced which will point out what variety of creations one may paſs through, and how many more we know not. Take Eve for inſtance. The matter of which ſhe was produced exiſted in the chaotic earth, then in Adam it was *formed* from the duſt of the ground, after this out of Adam's rib ſhe was *builded* a woman, then by marriage ſhe was *made* a wife, and then ſhe was alſo *conſtituted* the mother of all living, and if Adam had been a King ſhe might have been *created* a Queen, and ſo have paſſed through all the ſcripture creations, and yet not one of them either figurative or out of nothing, but all real as to nature or ſtate. To create a city or kingdom, make ſubjects, form a conſtitution, make a teſtament, ſtrike a covenant, enact a law, are real creations, and yet none of them are out of nothing. The chriſtian ſabbath is a day the Lord hath *made* out of time exiſting in other days.

As a new creation chriſtianity is definitively, *the conſtitution of all things conſtitutively made and executively introduced: conſtitutively it is univerſal*, not as to all *kinds* of things, but as to all things of a certain ſpecies, not natural, or material, but ſpiritual, holy, heavenly, and divine.

It was *executively introduced* among angels by their obedience to the command to *worship the first begotten*, when he was brought *again* into the world at his resurrection. Heb. i. 6. It is also introduced *executively* among men by *faith*, or their becoming *new creatures* in Christ Jesus. But common sense teaches that there can be no new creatures without a new creation. The being of a species supposeth a genius, the existence of an effect argues an antecedant cause.

1. This new creation consists in the formation, and erection of a state of general *peace*, and *reconcilement*.

The moral creation of God had become divided and hostile to each other. There was no holy society between the virtuous, and sinful rebellious part of God's subjects. The present state of natural things in our system significantly represents the anterior state of rationals as to God and one another. On one side was God and holy angels, on the other was devils and rebel men. The first thing to be done was to *make peace, and to effect a reconcilement* between these opposite and contending parties to make them one whole again as they were in their first creation. God the common Father of his intelligent offspring is the first mover in this benevolent design, and wisely contrives and adopts the expedient of a propitiation and atonement: not to render him propitious but to open the way for his exercise of grace and mercy, consistent with a declaration of his public regard to justice. He forecordains and provides the *peace maker*, even his own Son, at whose birth *peace* was proclaimed to the earth. From the time of this forecordination of Christ, the execution of justice according to the law transgressed was suspended, and trespasses were not imputed, as it had pleased God to adopt and use means of reconciliation. Every divine dispensation of religion in our world, hath evident marks of an offended, and yet reconcileable Deity's hand in it. Why should God place human spirits among

beasts in paradise, and in animal bodies, and give them no preeminence above them in rank but in order to manifest them that they were not what they had been but were now under his displeasure? Would holy spirits of celestial extraction, cognation, and alliance, have ever been so unequally yoked to terrestrial animal bodies, and been sunk into a local subjection to the god of this world, by the benevolent Father of spirits? Far be it from any to suppose any such thing of the God who is love, and who is also wise, holy, and just. But if man's spirit is considered as having fallen through abuse of liberty, and that his benevolent parent is meditating his restoration after proper chastisement, and using means to fit him for reception to his favor, the paradisaical economy and all after dispensations till the fullness of times, appear wise and benevolent: and especially doth the actual establishment of the gospel in the first step of it, viz. making peace by the blood of the cross of Christ, who is therefore called our *peace*, and his covenant, a covenant of *peace*. Then a state of reconcilement was *creatively* erected. Eph. ii. 13, 14, 15. A proclamation of peace is issued, the word of reconciliation given, the ministry of reconciliation instituted, and ambassadors for Christ ordained, and sent forth in his name to persuade to an actual reconcilement to God. It is impossible there should be any executive introduction of peace, without a previous *creative establishment of a state of peace and reconcilement.* And of this creation of peace the whole world, for whose sins Christ is the propitiation, reap the benefit, in not being treated according to legal justice: and nothing prevents their actual reconcilement, but their refusing to lay down the weapons of their rebellion and warfare, and not accepting of the terms of peace. That all men without exception are comprized in this settlement of peace, besides the scripture use of the universal terms, of all, and every man, the world, and *whole* world, may

appear from hence, *that in acts of indemnity, the non excepted are included.* Put the case that a common Father of a numerous offspring all issuing from his essence upon the declension of some is willing to reduce the revolters, all equally undeserving, and the price paid to restore *one* would be equal to the restoration of *all*, can it be supposed that a benevolent parent would merely for his pleasure, withhold his intention of extending the ransom to all, or a just parent *invite all* in a public explicit manner to come and accept of the tender, when secretly there is no offer made to them, as there was no ransom paid for them? If an earthly parent would not do thus, how much less would the Father of angels and men, do any thing of this kind? And as we read that the glory of a King consists in the multitude of his subjects, we may well suppose that a parent would be equally concerned to have his offspring increased, by a restoration of such as have been unhappily left to go astray: and would not be angry forever, lest they should be driven to desperation; and if he was divine, and they spirits and souls, lest they should fail before him. It may be concluded Christ hath made a general peace: that the state of peace is open for all to enter, and none are excluded. And this could not have been without a creation.

2. There is a new creation of the kingdom of God.

The kingdom of God, of Christ, and of Heaven, which are the same, came at our Savior's resurrection when its constitution was established, and it received a new form: Of original, it became mediatorial: The law was changed from the holy spiritual moral law, to the gospel law of grace, faith and liberty. The sovereignty of it is *new*: and so are its subjects. God indeed is supreme in this, as he was in the first, but it is under a new character, as the God of grace, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The administration of the original kingdom was by God all in all. There was no mediator,

renewer or ſanctifier in that kingdom as none were needed. But the adminiſtration of this is by a trinity of divine perſons. Could all this be done without a political creation. Even holy angels are analogically reconciled, and recapitulated in Chriſt: and even created by him, as thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, and have a new object of worſhip, the firſt begotten, or the Lamb that had been ſlain, but was now riſen, and for a new reaſon, *becauſe* he had been ſlain. Angels as well as human ſaints are citizens of the New Jeruſalem, but could they be ſo unleſs the city of God was made new? The whole polity of heaven hath paſſed through what politicians call a regeneration; and the ſcriptures a creation. Where any of the ſubjects of the ancient kingdom keep their ſtanding, they come under a new denomination: and where any of the old commands or ſtatutes are retained and adopted, they come under a new conſideration, as created by a new authority, impoſed upon new ſubjects, obſerved from new principles, enforced with new motives, and requiring new meaſures of obedience.

The new created conſtitution of the new kingdom of God is the new teſtament, covenant, and law which have been deſcribed. This with all goſpel inſtitutions, ordinances, ſacraments, offices, and officers are new creations. We have a new book of life, a new rule and mode of worſhip, new promiſes, new examples, a new day of worſhip, new ſacrifices, a new altar, and a new ſanctuary, &c. could all theſe things be without a creation. The writer to the Hebrews ſpeaks of a *world to come*, put in ſubjection to Chriſt. But how could that world exiſt, without being the creation of God by him?

A new ſtate of righteouſneſs and remiſſion of ſins, demands a new creation to eſtabliſh it. And this is really eſtabliſhed by the grace of God through the redemption of Chriſt. Neither righteouſneſs nor remiſſion of ſins are to be obtained by the

law. None ever was juſtified by the terms of the old covenant, but by the new in Chriſt's blood, and not by a perfect obedience of their own, or an others imputed to them. The doctrine of imputation as commonly held to, is very abſurd. To impute what belongs to one perſon, to another opens a door to all licentiouſneſs, and is the popiſh doctrine of ſupererogation in another ſhape : for how can one be righteous, by another's acts ; without making them his own ?

Not to anticipate any thing concerning juſtification and imputation in order thereunto : The new creation of which we are now treating, is a total change of the politic ſtate of all things and perſons in the kingdom of God, and alſo of the real ſtate of ſome of them at leaſt. They are all new by creation. Whatever belongs to the chriſtian cenſus is new : old things are paſſed away, behold all things are become new. Chriſt is *made* of God to us wiſdom, righteouſneſs, ſanctification and redemption, and we are *made* the righteouſneſs of God in him. Is there no creation in this ? We as chriſtians are by Chriſt as the one Lord, and when this executively takes place, we become the workmanſhip of God created in Chriſt Jeſus, are new creatures by being in him, and in chriſtianiſm of ſtate and condition. There is a being in Chriſt *vitally* as the branches are in the vine, and *ſocietively*, as the wife is in her huſband, and head. But neither of theſe is poſſible without a creation. All of chriſtianity is a new creation.

## CHAP. XIV.

### OF JUSTIFICATION AND SALVATION.

*Of juſtification and ſalvation: both impoſſible to men by the law, either by their own righteouſneſs, or the righteouſneſs of another imputed to them: the goſpel way of juſtification and ſalvation is of grace, through Chriſt, by faith imputed, and by conſequent new obedience.*

JUSTIFICATION and ſalvation are the two great things man now needs: the firſt relates to what is paſt, and, the other to what is to come, at leaſt in actual poſſeſſion. That juſtification is not, and never was in this world poſſible to man by the deeds of the law, or the firſt covenant, as a rule of judgment in his caſe, is a point to be proved. And is eaſily proved, if St. Paul is admitted as an authority, becauſe it is a matter he hath fully debated from its firſt principles, and argues the impoſſibility of the thing, againſt Jews and Gentiles as a matter of the utmoſt importance. Yet ſome by an unnatural mixture of law and grace, have removed this doctrine from its evangelical baſis, and even from the bodies of common-ſenſe. And by a ſtrange uſe of *imputation* have contradicted the expreſs poſitive aſſertion of the Apoſtle that none are juſtified by the deeds of the law; Rom. iii. 20. Which as much excludes believers as any other men, either by their own, or any righteouſneſs imputed to them, if the law of the rule and meaſure of judgment in their caſe. And the above aſſertions will not appear groundleſs, if the law is defined. And juſtification and ſalvation according to the goſpel are explained.

1. A definition of the law and the deeds of it, is to be given.

Now by the law is to be underſtood the firſt teſtament or covenant, and whatſoever is involved in it. And whether it is taken for the law of Moſes, as oppoſed to grace and truth by Jeſus Chriſt: or for the law the Gentiles were under: or for the holy ſpiritual moral law of God: the law in every ſenſe it was added to the promiſe, or was a ſchool maſter to Chriſt; juſtification to man is not poſſible by it.

As to the deeds of the law, they are all the acts and doings of men under the law, and not under grace: all works of righteouſneſs we have done as born of the will of man: all our own righteouſneſs, the natural man's works as influenced thereunto by the law of his mind: all works before faith whether ceremonial or moral. Theſe are called our own righteouſneſs, or works of righteouſneſs we have done: And are not oppoſed to any righteouſneſs of Chriſt ſuppoſed to be "imputed to us, and received by faith alone," but to faith itſelf and the good works of the new man. St. Paul never touches upon the modern diſpute, whether faith ſeparate from its fruits juſtifyeth; His diſpute was with legaliſts, whether we are juſtified of grace, by faith in Chriſt, or by the deeds of the law, without grace or Chriſt, ſo as to render the reward of debt, and to lay a foundation for boaſting in ourſelves. All his argumentation is againſt the law, and its religioniſts, and their propoſed way of attaining righteouſneſs, by their works and doings while under the law. They were ignorant of God's righteouſneſs, and went about to eſtabliſh their own, and did not ſubmit themſelves to the righteouſneſs of God. Rom. x. 3. Their own righteouſneſs they went about to eſtabliſh, was not faith, or its fruits: nor doth the righteouſneſs of God which they did not ſubmit to, ever ſignifying the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt. They followed after righteouſneſs but did not attain to (the benefit part) of the law of righteouſneſs, becauſe

they ſought it not by faith, but *as to be obtained* (as the original is) *by* the works of the law, for they ſtumbled, &c. Rom. ix. 31, 32.

The works of the law exclude faith, as faith, excludes them, it is not becauſe they are *works* but works of the *law*, that they are excluded from any influence in juſtification, and even ſalvation alſo, for what excludes from the one, doth from the other. Faith itſelf is a *work*, as much as any legal work whatſoever. It is the *work of God*, an *act* of *obedience* to a command. John vi. 29. I. John iii. 23. The apoſtle contends for a way of juſtfiication which excludes all boaſting in ourſelves, which the legal way did not: Rom. iii. 27. and is ever careful to diſtinguiſh faith, and legal works, and to aſſert the neceſſity of a living faith as an evangelical work. Some have conſidered faith only as a hand to receive *Chriſt's righteouſneſs as imputed by which* they ſuppoſe we are juſtified and not by faith. "This ſaith Luther, is the doctrine of a ſtanding or falling church." See alſo the aſſembly's catechiſm, in anſwer to, "What is juſtfiication?" When faith is imputed to us for righteouſneſs, they ſay, it is to be underſtood *organically* for the righteouſneſs of Chriſt. See Pool and Burkitt on Rom. iv. 3. But how the act or work of faith ſhould by imputation be turned into the righteouſneſs of Chriſt is hard to conceive of. Beſides the word *righteouſneſs* doth not mean the righteousneſs of Chriſt, but that *ſtate* of righteouſneſs which God hath creatively eſtabliſhed through Chriſt's redemption, or the benefit of righteouſneſs viz. juſtification. It is therefore called the righteouſneſs of God, and the righteouſneſs of God (the Father) by the faith of Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe we become the ſubjects of it by the *imputation* of faith to us.

The deeds of the law ſtand in the ſame relation to the old covenant, that faith doth to the new covenant. To the working legaliſt the reward is reckoned of debt and not of grace.

And if it be of works grace is ſet aſide. Rom. iv. 4. Rom. xi. 6.

Works ſtand oppoſed to no imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt but to faith imputed. And the former is not the ground or matter of our juſtification upon the foot of law: but faith itſelf as imputed to us is the *ground* and *matter* of our juſtification by the new teſtament in his blood. Chriſt himſelf and none elſe was ever juſtified by obedience to the law. But we are juſtified freely by his grace through the redemption of Chriſt from the laws by the imputation of faith to us for righteouſneſs or juſtification. And we ſhall prove hereafter that all legal works done by us, or by Chriſt are excluded from being the *ground*, *reaſon* or *matter* of our juſtification by the law, either before God the Creator, or God the Redeemer.

2. Juſtification, and ſalvation in the goſpel ſenſe are to be explained.

*Salvation* is allowed to be a deliverance from all the criminal and penal evils, both ſpiritual and eternal men are expoſed to here, and hereafter: with a right to, and poſſeſſion of all ſpiritual and eternal bleſſings in heavenly places by Chriſt. It includes in it the reſurrection of the body, and the eternal happineſs of ſoul and body in heaven.

As to the ſcriptural ſignification of juſtification, all are not agreed therein.

The Engliſh word juſtify, is from the Latin word juſtifico, which with the Greek Dikaio and Hebrew Hitzdik ſignify to *make* juſt or righteous, as to ſanctify is to *make* holy, yet Knox in his Eſſays ſaith, to juſtify is no where in ſcripture to *make righteous*, when the very word is juſtum facere, to make righteous. Rom. v. 19. But perſons may be made righteous in various ſenſes. *Intrinſicly* and *really* by renewing them in righteouſneſs. Chriſt is made of God to us wiſdom righteouſneſs, and ſanctification, and redemption: not by imputation?

for imputed wisdom sanctification and redemption, are as proper as imputed righteousness, but righteousness is not imputed unless the subject is *a doer of righteousness*. But most commonly to make righteous, or to justify, is to do it extrinsicly as to *state*, and not as to nature. And this is done *mentally*, by a man wise in his own conceit: *verbally* by the defender of a criminal: *Judicially sententially*, and *declaratively* by a judge who acquits a person. And *demonstratively* by one who undertakes to make the righteousness of another to *appear*. In *treatment* and *usage* our Savior was *made a sinner*: and in the same way a criminal may be made righteous. But God will not so justify the wicked. Deut. xxv. 1. By his words a man is *declared*, evidenced to be just. Matt. xii. 37. Our Savior's righteousness was *demonstrated* by the spirit that raised him from the dead, and so was *justified in or by the spirit*. I. Tim iii. 16.

But in none of these senses are any of mankind justified by the law, or the first covenant, for this one good reason, viz. all are *ungodly*, *sinners*, and *condemned* by the law, believers as much as any, and God cannot make a false judgment by declaring him *just* by a law of which he is a transgressor, and by which he is condemned, if the law hath its course upon him, he is kept under it, and treated according to it.

The considering justification as a *forensic* term, and a mere *judicial declarative* act as opposed to condemnation, is by no means satisfactory. Because the question is not how the *righteous* shall be justified, but how the *ungodly* and the *sinner* can be justified. Can the real criminal and guilty by law, be declared righteous in law by a just Judge? To ascribe the condemnation and justification of the same subject to the power of the same law is absurd. To get over this difficulty, it hath been said without the least proof, that the original law run in this conditional strain, "Do this in yourselves or surety and live." And although we failed in ourselves, yet as Christ fulfilled the

law as our ſurety, we are juſtified by the law through what he did being imputed to us. But this is all inconſiſtency and abſurdity. The law run in no ſuch conditional ſtrain, but curſeth every one that doth not obey it. Chriſt was no ſurety of the old teſtament, but of the new. Nothing belonging to, or done by one, is ever in ſcripture ſaid to be imputed to *another*. Imputation doth not transfer qualities; impute wiſdom to a fool, and he is the ſame ſtill: impute righteouſneſs to the ungodly, and he is the ſame ſtill according to the law he hath tranſgreſſed.

Juſtification is not therefore in the ſcripture ſenſe, a mere *judicial ſentential act, but a creative ſovereign act is complicated with it.* It is the *making the ungodly righteous*, by ſuch a *creative act* as ſovereigns uſe when they make nobles of plebians, or freemen of ſlaves. When God made the new teſtament covenant and law then he created a new *ſtate of remiſſion of ſins and of righteouſneſs*, whereby the ungodly by law, but believers by the goſpel, by God's grace through Chriſt's redemption, may have the ſtate and condition of righteous perſons granted unto them, and be *declared* righteous according to the law of grace and faith, which is the rule and meaſure of judgment in their caſe Here is no imputation of the righteouſneſs of another, but of faith for righteouſneſs. The believer is not ungodly by the goſpel while the righteouſneſs of the law, as to the matter of it, is fulfilled in him, by his walking not after the fleſh, but after the ſpirit. Rom. viii. 4.

3. The goſpel way of juſtification and ſalvation, may now be eaſily explained.

None are juſtified in the ſight of God in any ſenſe by the deeds of the law, or according to the old covenant, either by inherent righteouſneſs, their own righteouſneſs, or the righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to them.

All are guilty and ungodly by law and under condemnation. See chap. ii. The law requires ſinleſs perpetual obedience of every individual under it, and curſes the diſobedient, though but in one point, it is therefore abſolutely impoſſible the tranſgreſſor ſhould be juſtified by the law that condemns him. The ſinner is as much bound to *puniſhment* as a debt of juſtice, as the obedient are to a reward of debt. Neither repentance nor faith are any requiſitions of the law, make no compenſation for paſt offences, nor can any future obedience ever ſo perfect, if it were poſſible, juſtify him that hath once offended. If the law is holy and the Lawgiver juſt, every ſoul of man muſt forever deſpair of juſtification by the law. And as to a ſubſtitute obeying the law for man, and ſuffering the penality, ſo that by the imputation thereof to him, he ſhould be juſtified by the law, this is repugnant to the maxims of the law and goſpel, and even to common ſenſe. Crimes differ from debts: a reparation for a perſonal treſpaſs, doth not ſatisfy for the violation of a public law.

The allowance of a ſubſtitute is of grace, and ſo far law is no more law. And as to the ſcripture notion of imputation, or non imputation, it ever reſpects what is a man's own, and not what is another's transferred to him. II. Sam. xix. 19. Rom. iii. 26. iv. 3, 4, 5, 9. Gal. iii. 6. The not imputing treſpaſſes ſuppoſes the being of them, and that they might be imputed and puniſhed according to law: but the execution of law is ſuſpended for ſome reaſon or other. II. Cor. v. 19. The imputing or reckoning righteouſneſs to one, is the accounting ſomething which he hath done, to him, for righteouſneſs or juſtification. Thus Abraham's faith or believing, and not the object of it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs. In Philemon we have an account of imputation which Dr. Doddridge quotes to juſtify the reckoning to one what another hath

done, but it is not to his purpose. Onesimus had run away from Philemon: Paul finds him and converts him to christianity, and sends him back to his master, and writes a letter for his favorable reception in which are these words: "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account: (impute it to me:) I Paul have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it." He made the debt his own, and gave a note of hand for payment if demanded: his act, not Philemon's, made the imputation lawful. But what is this to a Judge's imputing the sin or righteousness of one to another? One man's faith, repentance, ideas, consciousness, personal identity, misery and happiness, may be imputed to another, as well as his sin or righteousness. Imputation is the act of God as a Sovereign or Judge, and ever supposes the being of what is imputed, in the subject antecedent to such imputation, and doth not constitute any a sinner or righteous person by that arbitrary act. But are not many made (or constituted) sinners by one man's disobedience: and by the obedience of one many *made* (constituted) righteous? Yes: but not by *imputation*. Adam was the means of introducing his natural descendants into the *state* of sinners: as Christ is the means of introducing believers in him, into the *state* of righteous persons. Adam, though destitute of original righteousness, was placed in a state of innocence as to the law he was under: so Shimei, though destitute of true goodness, was by Solomon placed in a state of innocence as to the particular prohibition he was under. Adam voluntarily departed from innocence, that brought him into the state of a sinner by the constitution of God: and by the same constitution all his natural descendants are born in the same state that he was in: they have bodies of *sin and death*, are flesh born of flesh, and that flesh is *sinful*. But nothing is imputed to them until they do something *themselves* to make them sinners. They suffer in the *course of*

*nature* upon his account, but not in the *courſe of law.* This is their infelicity, but not their ſin, until luſt conceives and brings forth ſin.

So on the other hand, God hath ſet forth Chriſt to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his (own) righteouſneſs, for the remiſſion of ſins that are paſt, through the forbearance of God; that he might be juſt and the juſtifier of him that believeth in Jeſus. Rom. iii. 25, 26. Chriſt redeemed us from the curſe of the law by being made a curſe for us. Gal. iii. 13. He is the *end* of the law for righteouſneſs (juſtification) to every one that believeth. Rom. x. 4. We are become dead to the law by the body of Chriſt. Rom. vii. 4. If the law is ended for righteouſneſs: and we are dead to it, delivered from it, and not under it, we are in no ſenſe juſtified by it, but by another law which can give life, even by the law of faith which excludes all boaſting. In this way God exhibits a public declaration of his own righteouſneſs, and regard to juſtice. And at the ſame time by a *ſovereign creative act*, through Chriſt's redemption, and in conſideration of his magnifying the law and making it honorable, in his life and death, eſtabliſheth the new covenant in his blood, according to which faith is imputed for righteouſneſs, the ſtate of righteouſneſs is granted to believers, and they are *declared* alſo to be righteous in the ſight of God according to the tenor of the goſpel, being freed from the law of ſin and death, by the law of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus. Rom. viii. 2.

Chriſt was delivered for our offences and raiſed again for our juſtification. Rom. iv. 25. Iſa. liii. 8. God in raiſing Chriſt from the dead, juſtified him, gave him a perfect abſolution from the ſentence of death, and ſolemnly diſcharged him, and the whole world from all ſins againſt the law: which world he is reconciling to himſelf in Chriſt, not imputing to them their treſpaſſes. II. Cor. v. 19. Chriſt alone was juſti-

fied by the law. He magnified it, made it honorable and ended it: and God at his reſurrection *creatively formed a ſtate* of remiſſion of ſins and of righteouſneſs, in the new teſtament in his blood. And by this ſovereign ſuperlegal act believers have their juſtification. Not that every believer was then actually juſtified, but ſuch a *ſettlement* was made, that all upon believing are *creatively made righteous in ſtate, and declared righteous in diſpoſition and practice.* They that believe are under grace, and in a *raiſed condition* with him. Coloſ. ii. 12. and iii. 1. which implies that they have their ſtate of righteouſneſs and juſtifiedneſs by the act of God in raiſing Chriſt from the dead. The reſurrection of Chriſt is the beginning of the new creation and conſtitution of things according to which the ungodly by law, but believers of the goſpel, enter the ſtate of righteouſneſs, and ſo are conſtituted righteous by the obedience of one, as many were conſtituted ſinners by the diſobedience of one. This is called the righteouſneſs of God, the righteouſneſs of God by faith, the gift of righteouſneſs, and the gift by grace. It is the righteouſneſs of God the Father, and not the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, though it is granted through his redemption, freely by grace, imputing faith for juſtification.

With this creative ſovereign act of grace, a *judicial ſentential act* is complicated, whereby believers are *declared the righteous in diſpoſition and practice* according to the goſpel law, becauſe they are really the doers of righteouſneſs inchoatively and initially. God cannot paſs a wrong judgment, nor account any righteous, who are not truly ſo, according to that law by which he judges of their character. If the believer was as ungodly in the eye of the goſpel, as he is on the foot of law, God would not declare him righteous; no imputation of what another had done would alter his perſonal character. Only the doer of righteouſneſs is righteous. I. John iii. 7. Goſpel believers are poſſeſſed of a character that diſtinguiſheth them

from unbelievers, as being *born of God, and without guile.* John i. 12. Pſ. xxxii. 2. Rom. iv. 6, 7. and in view of their character God declares them righteous. Thus by the *creative act* of God their ſtate is changed from the ſtate of death, to the ſtate of life: and from the ſtate of condemnation by the law, to the ſtate of juſtification by the goſpel. And by the *judicial ſentential* act God *declares* them righteous, and is gracious and alſo juſt in thus juſtifying the believer. Theſe acts are united, ſo that their juſtification is not *two fold*, though *a two fold act* is complicated therein. Some divines have made uſe of the example of Zaleucus the Locrian lawgiver to illuſtrate the doctrine of juſtification. The law was that an adulterer ſhould loſe both his eyes. The prince was guilty. The Father and lawgiver put out one of his own eyes, to preſerve one of his Son's eyes. But this is no way, parallel, for the Father's act was not legal: the Son could not by any imputation of the Father's deed be declared juſtified by the law: nor had he any character anſwering to the law, the law was not ſatisfied, magnified made honourable, or made new, nor the Son's future obedience ſecured. He might offend again, and his Father and he loſe their other eyes: and after *that* be guilty and not puniſhable by that law.

Suppoſe a king is inclined to receive a number of rebel ſubjects, to acquit them from the guilt they have contracted, and the puniſhment they have deſerved by law, to beſtow upon them farther privileges, and make them good ſubjects in future. It is certain their reſtoration muſt be by a *gracious, ſovereign, ſuperlegal, and not a judicial ſentential act*: for the law of the kingdom as now conſtituted conſiders them as rebels, and condemn them. If they are reſtored by prerogative power, without doing any thing to honor and magnify the law, and ſhew the kings regard to juſtice, it may argue weakneſs in him, or rigour and injuſtice in the law, and embolden

the ſame or others to tranſgreſs in expectation of like impunity. And if theſe perſons are reſtored, their temper and character remaining the ſame, with the weapons of rebellion in their hands, the juſtice of government will be impeached, all loyalty will be deſtroyed, and the ſafety of the ſtate endangered. The King deviſes this expedient, he ſets his Son, with his own conſent to ſtand in the rebels ſtead, to obey the law perfectly, and to ſuffer the penalty ſo far as an innocent perſon can, which is deemed ſufficient to do honor to the law, and to redeem theſe rebels from under it. And in conſideration of what the prince hath done, and ſuffered in their behalf, he paſſes an act of indemnity, ſuſpends the operation of the law, and doth not impute their treſpaſſes to them according to it, but puts an end to the conſtitution and law as it now ſtands, not becauſe it is unjuſt, but weak and unable to give life, to thoſe who have forfeited it, though it was ordained to continue life to ſuch as obeyed it, and hath thus far preſerved life to the ſubjects who continue loyal. The king in conſequence of the obedience and ſufferings of the prince, makes by him a new ſettlement of the kingdom, whereby rebels of a certain deſcription, ſhall be received to favor, and in conjunction, with thoſe who retained their loyalty from one polity, under God and the Prince by whom the government is adminiſtered according to the new conſtitution of the kingdom The compliance of the loyal ſubjects with this conſtitution of things is the condition of their confirmation in their preſent ſtanding under the Prince as their head : And the rebels compliance with this new ſettlement, through belief of its truth, actually paſſes them from under the ancient law according to which they are rebels, and brings them under the new law of grace, by which they have liberation and life. Thus they are not without law to the king, but under law to the Prince.

" There is no condemnation belongs to them : They have all the prileges and immunities of good ſubjects while they continue loyal to the king and Prince, obey the old commands and new : and the prince is their ſurety that they ſhall not fail of this. This is a better ſtatement than that illuſtrated by the example of Zaleucus, or than that which ſuppoſes the original law to have been conditional, binding us or our ſurety, or any juſtification by the law through imputation. If a few queſtions are aſked and anſwered it will ſerve more fully to illucidate the ſubject. How comes it there is any ground of hope for theſe rebels ? Anſwer by the grace of the king, and not for any antecedent goodneſs of theirs. Through whoſe interpoſition is this reſtoration effected ? Anſwer that of the prince : for the king in conſideration of his doings and ſufferings, hath paſſed a creative act in their favor. By what law are they juſtified ? not by the old law by which they are rebels, but by the new law, by which they have freedom and life. What is the ground or matter of their freedom ? Their reception of and ſubmiſſion to this act of grace, is their *acquittance* from offences that are paſt : and their demeaning themſelves as good ſubjects is the ground of the kings *declaring* them to be ſuch according to the ſame law. How are they able to comply with this new ſettlement ? By the ſuretyſhip and aſſiſtance of the Prince. Surely all boaſting in themſelves is hereby excluded, and if they glory it muſt be in the Lord their righteouſneſs and ſtrength.

The doctrine of the imputation of the ſin or righteouſneſs of one to another as it hath been, and is now held to by many, doth not aſcribe righteouſneſs to God, and in its direct conſequences blunts conviction for ſin, and deſtroys the neceſſity of perſonal righteouſneſs, though ſome endeavor to obviate this latter conſequence, but in vain. For if a man may be criminal and be

punished in law, for another act he never consented to, by the imputation of the judge. And be righteous also in the same way by another's doings, there can be no encouragement to avoid personal sin, no conviction of guilt for what a man never committed: nor any need of personal holiness, since he may be as righteous as Christ is, as some dare to speak, and yet in temper and conduct be a devil. For if Satan was clothed with the borrowed robes of Deity by imputation he would be a devil still intrinsicly and really. And so may the justified by imputation be really ungodly in the eye of the law and gospel, for faith alone is dead, and can be no good work itself, or have good works for its fruits.

*That the doctrine of evangelical justification may want nothing to place it in a clear point of light*, the faith *imputed for righteousness shall be described: And the distinct places of grace: Of Christ's redemption: And of faith in this affair, be shewn.*

1. The believer being the gospel subject of justification, by the imputation of his faith for righteousness, that *faith* which justification is connected with, must be described.

The object of faith in general is the revealed truth of God in Jesus Christ, whether it is contained in the old, or new testament scriptures. Where one object of faith is expressed in one place, it must be understood as comprehending all others then revealed The old testament saints were God's believers under his then revealed character. They were Christ's prophetic believers so far as the revelations of their time did permit. To us christians God in his new testament character is the principal object of faith: as the only true God, the God and Father, and sender of Christ. John v. 24. John xvii. 3. I. Pet. ii. 21.

Jesus Christ is another principal object of faith under the various offices and titles he sustains, and as having performed, or performing the several works ascribed to him: And particularly Christ as crucified, and his blood shed as procuring

redemption, according to the new teſtament as made by it. The Holy Spirit alſo in his perſon and offices is an object of faith. Theſe are perſonal objects: the whole of divine revelation is an impersonal object of faith. Divine truths are to be judged of and eſteemed according to their importance, and conſtituted connection with juſtification and ſalvation. Some truths are fundamental, but how far theſe are extended in particular caſes, is indeterminable by man. Where a man's belief prevents his holding the head, or manifeſtly deſtroys the foundation of evangelical practical piety and virtue, he can have no hope of ſalvation upon good grounds, yet it becomes not us to judge him; but after trying to convince him of his error, he muſt be left to his own maſter to ſtand or fall by his deciſion.

But as to the act, perſuaſion, or work called faith with which juſtification and ſalvation are connected, it is repreſented in ſcripture as being of a peculiar kind, as appears by its ſcripture names, the faith of God, the faith of Jeſus Chriſt, the faith of God's elect, a belief with the heart and with all the heart, faith unfeigned, &c. and alſo becauſe devils and wicked men have a *kind* of faith, and yet are in no way of juſtification or ſalvation by it.

1. As connected with juſtification and ſalvation, faith is an act or work of one born of God. John i. 12, 13. I. John v.

Faith is a good work, but in order to a good work, the man muſt firſt be evangelically good, according to that maxim, "make the tree good and the fruit will be good." The goodneſs of the tree is the *cauſe* of the goodneſs of the fruit: the goodneſs of the fruit is only an *evidence* of the goodneſs of the tree. Law religioniſts and natural men may have a *kind of faith*, as well as work, but both are ſpecifically different from the faith of God's elect. Faith is not of nature or the law. Fleſh and blood give us no power to believe. Faith therefore is no part *of our own righteouſneſs, which is of the law.* The renouncing of faith as part of our own righteouſneſs, and as oppoſed

to the righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us, is a renunciation of the righteouſneſs which is of God by faith.

2. Faith is not only a ſupernatural, and ſuperlegal work, but ſpiritual and divine work.

There can be no natural power in any to perform a ſupernatural act: a thing muſt firſt be, and then act: the effect of a natural exertion can only be natural. Acts from one kind of life, cannot as a cauſe produce another kind of life. It is *given to men to believe*, and faith *is a work wrought in God.*

It never was a duty, or in man's power to give himſelf, or to act from that life which he hath not, in ſeeking to obtain it. Faith ordinarily comes by hearing, men have ears to hear, and in that way they may expect faith, if they join, ſearching of the ſcriptures, and prayer for faith, to their hearing of the word of God. Faith is ſpecifically a divine ſentiment or perſuaſion, whereby they who are poſſeſſed of it, ſymbolize with God and Chriſt. The perſuaſion they have of divine matters is not from nature or human inſtitution. Fleſh and blood cannot reveal it, "They that are after the fleſh judge after the fleſh, according to the ſpirit of the world." John viii. 15. I. Cor. ii. 12. But the ſentiment of true believers is according to God, Chriſt, and the ſpirit. As human weakneſs and wickedneſs are complicated in unbelief, ſo there is a divine greatneſs and goodneſs in true faith.

3. Evangelical faith is grounded on the teſtimony or witneſs of God. I. John v. 9, 10.

They who believe divinely realize God as ſpeaking in his word, and receive it as infallibly true, becauſe ſpoken by him who cannot lie. Of Chriſt, John the baptiſt ſaith, "He that receiveth his teſtimony hath ſet to his ſeal that God is true: for whom God hath ſent, ſpeaketh the words of God." John iii. 33. The Theſſalonians received the goſpel report, "Not as the word of man but of God." I. Theſ. ii. 13. They be-

divine impreſs on the ſcriptures, as they do on the viſible works of creation.

4. In faith there is a ſpiritual diſcernment of its object and evidence.

The truths believed appear in a true point of view, and though there ſhould be no addition to their ſpeculative knowledge, yet they now receive the things themſelves which are freely given of God, and ſo affectingly apprehend them, as to give to them a certain newneſs, and real exiſtence in their minds, in their divinity, glory, and appointed connection with eternal life. Heb. xi. 1. The unrenewed in knowledge do not know the ſpecific nature of the things to be believed, and ſo terminate their faith upon another kind of object, as the jews did upon another kind of Meſſiah, then the true Chriſt of God, or upon they *know not what*, like the Samaritans who intentionally worſhipped the true God, but did not know him.

5. This divine perſuaſion is ſo noble that the things of God it is converſant about, a have preeminence in point of goodneſs and importance, in the judgment of true believers. They have a right eſtimation of the value of things, and it is their faith that furniſhes them with it, and leads them to a right choice. Heb. xi. 24, 25, 26. Faith in this particular makes a vaſt difference between chriſtians and others. What is the one eſteemeth as *all*, the other counteth as *nothing*: what one calleth *home*, the other calleth a *ſtrange land*. *Him* whom the world ſets at *naught*, the other owns to be the only begotten of the Father, and God under the veil of fleſh, the form of a ſervant, and the ignominy of a croſs.

6. The faith connected with juſtification and ſalvation, is victorious and ſurmounteth all oppoſition. I. John v. 4. They who are poſſeſſed of it overcome all impediments from within or without, it purifies the heart, quenches the fiery darts of the wicked, and ſpiritualizeth the carnal mind.

7. It conſtitutes all poſſeſſed of it true and faithful. I. Tim. i. 5. Acts. viii. 37. Rom. x. 9. Heb. x. 22.

It is unfeigned, a belief of the heart, with a true heart, and with all the heart. God juſtifies none but the ſincere in whom there is no guile.

8. The faith we are deſcribing involves in it an act of confederation.

The phraſe of coming to God and Chriſt implies this. for the original word for *come*, is of the root from whence the Engliſh word proſelyte is derived. But none can be proſelytes to God and Chriſt but in the way of confederation. Juſtification being by faith in Chriſt's blood, and by the new teſtament in his blood, faith muſt neceſſarily involve in it, the laying hold of, and becoming a party in that covenant. Faith profeſſed, includes baptiſm for the remiſſion of ſins, and in the remiſſion of ſins paſt, juſtification in part, conſiſts. Rom. iii. 25, and iv. 6.

9. The faith which is unto juſtification and ſalvation, is vital and operative.

For as it proceeds from the life of God in man, it is the ſame with the new creature, and is equivalent to keeping the commandments of God. Gal. v. 6. and vi. 15. I. Cor. vii. 19. It is a work of God, and obeying a command. John vi. 29. I. John iii. 23. The neceſſity of its being obediential is fully proved by St. James, who quotes the ſame text to prove Abraham was juſtified by works when he offered up his Son, St. Paul doth to prove he was juſtified by faith: which is a plain evidence that Abraham was as truly God's believer in *conſenting* to offer his Son, for he never offered him, and which was alſo a work, as he was when he credited the divine promiſe. In crediting the divine promiſe, he was juſtified by the *creative act* of God and had the ſtate of a righteous perſon: by offering up his Son he was *declared* to be righteous, by a *judicial ſentential act*. In this way the two Apoſtles

rles are reconcilable. Paul excludes all deeds of the law from his faith, and James includes the fruits of faith in his. They who believe divinely practice divinely. For faith is either a good work itself, or the foundation of all gospel good works. And if in the instant of justification its effects and fruits are not produced, yet God views it as operative, and declares none righteous by the imputation of faith, who are not doers of righteousness, as opportunity offers, according to the gospel law.

2. The distinct places of grace: Christ's redemption: and faith in justification and salvation, are to be considered.

Christianity is not only the new kingdom of God, the new testament covenant and law: But it is definitively the religion of *saving grace*. We are justified by *grace*, and saved by *grace*, even through Christ's redemption, and faith.

Grace in a large sense is the same with kindness or favor. Gen. xxxix. 21. original. Zach. iv 7. And as it respects the present subject it may be considered as the *propitiousness* of the divine nature, and *immanent* in God: or as an act or effect proceeding from that cause whereby God is gracious. All favor and kindness which is *gratuitous*, and *not a due debt is grace*: but what is of debt is repugnant to grace. Rom. iv. 4.

Grace considered as *kindness* is opposed to *wrath*, and as it is *gratuitous favor*, it stands opposed to *legal justice*. The gifts of nature and providence however unmerited, are not grace in the gospel sense. Whatever is of grace transcends nature as well as law. There is no such thing as *natural or legal grace*. Christianity is the religion of grace as opposed to rigor and severity and wrath and to debt, to legal justice, and all that is natural. It also results from the will, purpose, and pleasure of God, and is therefore of *positive institution*. Eph. i. 5. 9, 11. The religion of saving grace originated from the purpose of the divine will.

Pure benevolence directed by wiſdom, originated the plan of redemption and ſalvation, foreordained Chriſt, choſe us in him before the foundation of the world, ſent Chriſt in the fulneſs of time to effect it, antecedent to any thing merited by Chriſt or us. This is the love which is the cauſe of the gift of Chriſt and of all things with him.

In the matter of juſtification and ſalvation, the ſettlement of theſe ſtates is of ſovereign grace. It is God that Juſtifies by a ſovereign ſuperlegal act, or by grace. Rom. iii. 24. This was creatively done at the reſurrection of Chriſt. Rom. iv. 25. And it actually takes place when individuals believe with their heart, for then they become entitled to impunity and life. God is in this act *gracious*, to the ungodly by law, who are believers in Chriſt: and *juſt* to Chriſt and believers by fulfilling his engagement and promiſe. Rom. iii. 26. I. John i. 9. By grace alſo, we are ſaved according to the mercy of God our Savior, even through Jeſus Chriſt our Savior. Eph. ii. 8. Titus iii. 5.

Through Chriſt's redemption the ſtate of righteouſneſs and ſalvation is creatively made, and according to this ſettlement, and not according to the law, God exerciſes his grace and juſtice in the juſtification and ſalvation of believers. The new teſtament is made in Chriſt's blood whereby, and according to which, we are juſtified and ſaved. This redemption is the ground of our deliverance from the law of ſin and death, and of our juſtification by faith in Chriſt from *all* things from which we cannot be juſtified by the law of Moſes. Legaliſts might be juſtified from *ſome* things by Moſes' law, that is as to their ſecular, carnal and national intereſt, but not as pertaining to the conſcience. The redemption of Chriſt ſtands in ſubordination to the grace of God, and is the ground on which the law of faith is made, and the medium through which grace reigns through righteouſneſs unto eternal life by Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.

The place of faith in our juſtification and ſalvation is ſubordinate to the grace of God, and the redemption of Chriſt.

Yet faith is of importance in this affair, becauſe faith as our act and work is imputed to us for righteouſneſs or juſtification. It is indeed a work of the new man wrought in God, yet it is the matter of our juſtification, as much as the perfect obedience of any under the law would be the matter of his juſtification by law. In the former caſe the reward is of grace, but in the latter it is of debt. The creative act of God hath made a ſtate of righteouſneſs through Chriſt's redemption: and the imputative act of God hath put faith in the place, and made it the *matter* of our juſtification before God, as the perfect ſinleſs obedience and ſufferings of Chriſt upon our account, was the *matter* of his juſtification before God by the law. God imputed this to him for righteouſneſs, and juſtified him in ſpirit when he raiſed him from the dead. As what Chriſt did and ſuffered was upon our account, ſo our faith is imputed to us for juſtification, as having fulfilled the goſpel law. And hereby all boaſting is excluded. Rom. iii. 27.

We utterly exclude any imputation of Chriſt's righteouſneſs for any purpoſe whatever. We thankfully own he is made of God to us, wiſdom, righteouſneſs, ſanctification and redemption. And wiſdom, ſanctification and redemption in the ſame way that he is righteouſneſs. But who was ever made wiſe, or holy, or redeemed, by the imputation of another's wiſdom, ſanctity or redemption to him? Common ſenſe reprobates the idea as ridiculous and abſurd, be it orthodoxy or what it will.

Chriſt is the author of wiſdom, ſanctification and redemption and God hath made him ſo by what he hath done and ſuffered upon our account, and by his word and ſpirit he works theſe in and for us: and ſo he is the author of the ſtate of righteouſneſs, and hath brought in everlaſting righteouſneſs, by the act of God imputing faith to believers for their juſtification.

The advocates for the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt are ſo ſenſible of the tendency of this their doctrine to exclude real perſonal righteouſneſs, though they generally intend no ſuch thing; that they take great pains to guard againſt the bad effects it may have upon men. After they have told us that the juſtified believer is as righteous as Chriſt is, by imputation: They exhort us to be holy, and not to ſin that grace may abound. And yet tell us our own righteouſneſs, by which they underſtood faith and good works, are as filthy rags and muſt be renounced. Their contradictions and inconſiſtencies cauſe them much trouble. And their doing and undoing bewilders others, if not themſelves. If the doctrine of the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt was true, it would naturally yield concluſions friendly to practical holineſs: and there would be no ſuch great occaſion to warn men againſt drawing ſuch evil conſequences from it, as they are juſtly afraid they will. If Chriſt's righteouſneſs imputed to them for juſtification, is ſufficient, what need is there of any other? If our being doers of righteouſneſs is of no importance, or if all that we do muſt be renounced as filthy rags, who will ever ſeek after perſonal righteouſneſs? If the hearts and lives of theſe men were not often better than their heads, and their principles lead them to be, their doctrine would be much more fatal. But it is certainly better to have the heart and head correſpond together, they ought to do, and may do, according to the above ſtatement of the doctrine of juſtification. Only ſettle it that we are juſtified by the goſpel and not by the law, by the new teſtament, and not the old: That God's grace under the direction of wiſdom contrived this method: that the redemption of Chriſt is the ground or reaſon of the making of the new teſtament, and that faith is imputed to us for righteouſneſs according to that, and there is no great danger of error, becauſe theſe are probable facts.

As to ſalvation the terms for that are the ſame with juſtification. For if any are juſtified by grace through faith, ſo they are ſaved by grace through faith. And if faith alone will anſwer for juſtification, it will for ſalvation the end of faith. In juſtification faith is conſidered as productive of fruits: in ſalvation as having produced them. But if the juſtified have not opportunity to do as they would, the will is accepted for the deed, as it was in Abraham's offering up his Son.

THE theoretic explanation of the Science of Sanctity is now finiſhed. One practical obſervation may be ſubjoined that the goſpel contains a perfect rule of life and righteouſneſs: grants no liberty to ſin, and affords or offers to all ſufficient aſſiſtance to enable them to comply with the terms therein propoſed.

Among all the rejectors of the goſpel doctrines, few have condemned its morality: but moſt have ſpoken highly of it, as containing the beſt directory or rule of life, for the regulation of temper, converſation, and conduct, towards God, man and ourſelves, that is any where to be found, in whatever ſtation and relation of life, we may be placed.

The royal law of God as written upon the hearts of men, publiſhed by Moſes and explained by the Prophets, containing the love of God and of our neighbours; and the doing to others as we would that they ſhould do unto us, contains a moſt excellent ſyſtem of piety, righteouſneſs ſobriety and charity. As Chriſt ſaith he came to *fulfil the law*, ſo one ſenſe in which he doth this is by extending and enlarging it. In his ſermon on the mount, and in his other diſcourſes, he adds ſome things to the law. Chriſtianity contains new cauſes, degrees, meaſures, objects and motives of duty to angels and men. In the goſpel we have the cleareſt notices of righteouſneſs and true holineſs, the greateſt and moſt precious promiſes to make us partakers of

the divine nature, and to animate us to cleanſe ourſelves from all filthineſs of fleſh and ſpirit, and to perfect holineſs in the fear of God. The grace of God which hath appeared to all men bringing ſalvation, teaches that denying, &c.

One thing more might be added, viz. that with the goſpel propoſal of ſalvation ſufficient grace and aſſiſtance are offered to men to enable them to comply with the terms of it. The Chriſtian religion is adapted to the preſent ſtate of man in the world, and conſiders him as what he is, and not what ſome have ſuppoſed him to be. It doth not require him to act from principles which he is not poſſeſſed of, in order to obtain what he wants. Men could not receive the grace of God in vain, if it was not given: nor reject the counſel of God againſt themſelves by a non compliance with the means of ſalvation, if there was no counſel of God that they ſhould uſe them, and that with ſuch uſe as they can make, they will by his grace, prove effectual to the deſired end. The helps the goſpel affords or offers are various, conſiſting in God's preventing grace, in the drawings of the Father, in the free ſupernal influence of the ſpirit, in the power of prayer, in the unction of the holy one Chriſt Jeſus, who is a magazine of grace, and of his fulneſs we may receive a ſupply of all our needs, in the prevalency of his interceſſion, in his divine example, in the goſpel miniſtry, in the holy ſacraments, in the communion of ſaints, and in the miniſtry of angels: all which ſerve to begin or carry on a good work in men, and by which God works in men, to will and to do of his good pleaſure. Men cannot be neglectors of a ſalvation not offered them ſo as they might receive it.

Since the whole deſign of the religion of God is to reſtore men to holineſs and happineſs, it hath been our aim in this theory to promote this end. The better the theoretic part is underſtood by men, the more likely it will be to have a practical influence on their hearts and lives. Conſiſtency is what the

human mind delights in : the divine plan is perfect ſelf conſiſtency, and the clearer our view of it is, the more readily ſhall we acquieſce in it. Whether we have contributed any thing towards giving ſuch a view of the ways of God to man, the reader is left to judge for himſelf. If any by what hath been written be engaged to acquire a habit of thinking upon ſubjects not much attended to, and the holy ſcriptures recover their due eſteem and place, from which they have been long excluded by tradition and the undeſerved veneration entertained for the ſuppoſed authority of fallible men : and the ſearches of the ſincere be directed, their faith increaſed, and their lives bettered, the author will not think his labor loſt :—For any good effected by this well meant, little encouraged, and much oppoſed publication, may the one God of grace, through the one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by the ſame Holy Spirit have all the praiſe.

THE END.

# CONTENTS.


CHAP. I.

AN IDEA OF GOD. 10

CHAP. II.

OF THE ORIGINAL CREATION AND KINGDOM OF GOD. 41

*An idea of the original creation and kingdom of God, conſidered materially, locally, and politically : The Conſtitution, law and ſubjects of that polity : conjectures when it was created : the Moſaic creation not the* firſt, *nor out of nothing : neither was it ſpiritual nor heavenly, but natural, terreſtrial and animal only : the original and preſent, natural and legal ſtate of the whole of man.*

CHAP. III.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. 83

*A delineation of the character of the Scriptures, as holy, popular, unphiloſophical, antimetaphyſical, and theopolitical.*

CHAP. IV.

OF GOD THE FATHER. 101

*Of the one God as the* Father : *a ſingular intellectualiſt : how* a *and* the *Father : foundation of his paternity, &c.*

## CONTENTS.

### CHAP. V.

OF THE SON OF GOD. 112

*Of the divine imperial Son of God, in his personal constitution and origination, by his Bethlehemetical generation, conception, and nativity: which was not humiliating, but honorary: His natures divine and human, and diginity thereby: His progress towards perfection, and the completion of his generative capacity as God with God in the beginning of the gospel epoch or era.*

### CHAP. VI.

OF THE INCARNATION, HUMILIATION, AND MISSION OF CHRIST. 143

*The mystery of Godliness, or the incarnation of the Messiah Jesus Christ explained: The form of God: His becoming flesh in the form of a servant in the likeness of men: His humiliation unto death: Exaltation to the throne of God: And the restitution of all things into the kingdom of God all in all. &c.*

### CHAP. VII.

OF THE OFFICIAL TITLE CHRIST. 169

*Of the personal name Jesus: His office as Christ: Dignity as the one Lord: A creator under this character: His creation a proof of his divinity of state and nature.*

### CHAP. VIII.

OF THE HOLY GHOST. 196

*Of the Holy Ghost: his personality, divinity, and office: a peculiar kind of person: the worship due to him according to his idea and work.*

## CONTENTS.


### CHAP. IX.

OF THE TRINITY. 197

*Of the Trinity: the Father the first person: the Son the second person: the Holy Ghost the third person: how they are three, and yet one in essence or nature, and in the sovereignty of God's kingdom.*

### CHAP. X.

OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD. 215

*The Kingdom of God of which the Christian Trinity are the Personal Sovereignty, defined and described.*

### CHAP. XI.

OF REGENERATION. 131

*The way of entering the kingdom of God by regeneration of state and nature, described.*

### CHAP. XII.

OF A TESTAMENT COVENANT AND LAW. 241

*Of a Testament Covenant, and Law: of the old: of the new: compared: the new the better Testament: Christ the Mediator of the new: his mediation: all his offices mediatorial.*

### CHAP. XIII.

CHRISTIANITY A NEW CREATION OF GOD BY CHRIST. 271

*Christianity considered as the new creation of God by Christ: And wherein it consists.*

## CONTENTS.

### CHAP. XIV.

OF JUSTIFICATION AND SALVATION. 284

*Of juſtification and ſalvation: both impoſſible to men by the law, either by their own righteouſneſs, or the righteouſneſs of another imputed to them: the goſpel way of juſtification and ſalvation is of grace, through Chriſt, by faith imputed, and by conſequent new obedience.*

---

ERRATA.

Page 11. line 34. for 45. read 4. p. 11. l. 32. r. creature-tranſcendant. p. 35. l. 5, 6. r. though all are now *natively* aliens, yet we be ſome ſedtively nigh. p. 36. l. 21. for this r. his. p. 64. l. 18. for of r. or. p. 72 l. 29, 30, r. Plotinus Cardan, Finellus. p. 84. l. 45. r. Antoninus, Zamolxis Plotinus. p. 97. l. 9. r. additious. p. 140. l. 15, for corp r. continuators. p. 183. r. Protokos. p. 198. l. 12. r. in a degree and manner tranſcendant. p. 202. l. 16. r. he was in *no* two ſtates. p. 205. l. 15. r. for analogy, ontology. p. 206. l. 30. r. Patripaſſians. p. 220. r. and to men a *religio remedians*, a remedial religion, and new to both. p. 228. l. 2. for mothers r. matters. p. 228. l. 1. d. be no. p. 234. l. 13. r. *from* above. p. 236. l. 5. for ſights, r. rites. l. 10. for dew, r. new. 253. l. 25. r. Ahab. p. 258. l. 18. r. Tindal. p. 284. l. 13. for bodies. r. bounds.